DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 575 CS 506 347

AUTHOR Merron, Jeff
TITLE Murrow on TV: "See It Now," "Person to Person," and the Making of a 'Masscult Personality.' Journalism Monographs Number 106.
INSTITUTION Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 44p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1621 College St., University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208-0251 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; *Broadcast Television; Journalism; *Journalism History; Middle Class Culture; *News Media; News Reporting; *Professional Recognition; Television Research
IDENTIFIERS *Broadcast Journalism; Journalism Research; *Murrow (Edward R); News Reporters; Television History; Television News

ABSTRACT

Edward R. Murrow is considered by many to be the first serious practitioner of broadcast journalism. In the 1950s he pioneered in developing the television documentary form with the "See It Now" series. A second series, "Person to Person," played a large part in popularizing the televised celebrity interview. Characterizations of Murrow as "swashbuckling" and "a genuine hero," while perhaps true, serve to obscure Murrow's real contributions to television journalism. Despite his production of many provocative and probing video segments, for example, for the most part he used television in a conservative manner--both "See It Now" and "Person to Person" were as formulaic and predictable as many other television programs. Both "See It now" and "Person to Person" were geared to mass audiences, as the medium of television demanded. The audience for each program differed, as did Murrow's demeanor on each night. Both of Murrow's programs influenced television journalism. He set standards still in effect at the networks today and was the role model for the television foreign correspondent. Journalists, critics, and media historians would like to remember Murrow as being something he was not: an individualist who never compromised his high journalistic standards in face of corporate pressure. He did compromise, and the result had many tangible benefits for him and for CBS. (One hundred and sixty-three notes are included.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JOURNALISM
MONOGRAPHS
Number 106 July 1988

ED298575

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Westley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Murrow on TV:

See It Now, Person to Person, and the Making of a 'Masscult Personality'

Jeff Merron

CS506347

An AEJMC Publication

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS is one of six publications of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication: *Journalism Quarterly* (Founded in 1924); *Journalism Educator* (founded in 1946); *Journalism Abstracts* (founded in 1963); *Journalism Monographs* (founded in 1966); *Journalism Directory* (founded in 1983); and *aejmc News*, the organization's newsletter.

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS was supported for its first two years by a gift from the University of Texas, and until 1979 by the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

Most editions of JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS are still in print and may be ordered from the Association. Microform and photocopies are also available through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. Please indicate series number, author and title when ordering single copies.

Monographs appearing here are regularly abstracted and indexed in *Historical Abstracts, America: History and Life and Resources in Education.*

Association for Education in Journalism
and Mass Communication

1621 College Street University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208-0251 (803) 777-2005

Jennifer McGill
Executive Director

Mary Jane Cone
Subscription Manager

Subscription Information

Address changes must reach the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication 30 days prior to the actual change of address to insure proper delivery. Copies undelivered because of address change will not be replaced. Other claims for undelivered copies must be made within four months of publication. You must give old address and zip code as well as new address on changes. Subscriptions are nonrefundable. Subscription Rates: US individual $20; US institution $25; Foreign individual $25; and Foreign institution $30 (air mail surcharge, $15). Single issues, $5 (air mail surcharge $3).

POSTMASTER: Send address correction form to AEJMC, 1621 College St., University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208-0251.

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS is published serially by AEJMC in Columbia, SC 29208-0251. Copyright 1988 by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

ISSN 0022-5525

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS
Number 106 July 1988

JOSEPH P. McKERNS, *Editor*

BRUCE H. WESTLEY, *Founding Editor* (term: 1966-1982)
LEE B. BECKER, *Past Editor* (term: 1982-1985)

Ann Major, *Art Director*

EDITORIAL BOARD

L. Erwin Atwood, Donald R. Avery, James L. Baughman, R. Thomas Berner, Beverly Bethune, Douglas Birkhead, Margaret A. Blanchard, Stuart J. Bullion, Thomas B. Connery, Dennis K. Davis, Everette E. Dennis, Robert E. Drechsel, David L. Eason, Terry Hynes, Owen V. Johnson, Arthur J. Kaul, David Kennamer, John Ledingham, Jerilyn McIntyre, Jack M. McLeod, John T. McNelly, Kent Middleton, John S. Nichols, David P. Nord, Vincent P. Norris, Marvin N. Olasky, John Pauly, Michael J. Petrick, Jim Richstad, Gertrude J. Robinson, Thomas A. Schwartz, J. William Snorgrass, Vernone M. Sparkes, George E. Stevens, Robert L. Stevenson, Vernon A. Stone, Bruce M. Swain, James E. Swartz, Phillip J. Tichenor, Richard C. Vincent, Daniel B. Wackman, Ellen Wartella, D. Charles Whitney.

Members of the AEJMC Publications Committee: Lee Becker, Sharon Dunwoody, George Everett, Sandra Moriarty, Carol Reuss, C. Zoe Smith *(Chair).*

Manuscripts and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to the incoming editor, James Tankard, Department of Journalism, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

TO CONTRIBUTORS

Submissions to *Journalism Monographs* should include an original and two copies, double-spaced throughout (including extracts, references and notes).

For style, authors must use one of these three: *A Manual of Style*, published by the University of Chicago Press; the *Publication Manual* of the American Psychological Association; or *A Uniform System of Citation*, published by the Harvard Law Review Association. The style chosen should be the one most appropriate to the subject matter of the manuscript submitted. Authors are expected to use the current edition of the style manual chosen. Footnotes and references should be assembled at the end of the manuscript. Tables and figures should be on separate pages, not in the text.

Authors are expected to be candid with the editor in matters pertaining to the origins and previous appearances of manuscripts. It is policy not to publish a long version of a study already published in a shorter version elsewhere.

JEFF MERRON

Murrow on TV: *See It Now, Person To Person,* and the Making of a 'Masscult Personality'

Copyright 1988
by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication

Accepted for Publication September 1986

JEFF MERRON is a Ph.D. student in Journalism at the University of North Carolina. This monograph is the result of his work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where he received a master's degree in Journalism and Mass Communication in December 1985. The author wishes to thank Gary Gaddy, Steve Vaughn, Andrew Feldman, Colin Campbell and Myrna Merron for helpful comments. Special thanks to his advisor, James L. Baughman, for his guidance, encouragement and inspiration. The author also wishes to thank Mrs. Janet Murrow for permission to quote from the Murrow papers.

AT THE PEAK of his television career in 1955, Edward R. Murrow was, wrote critic John Crosby, "the most towering figure on TV."[1] In 1953 *Newsweek* wrote, "A civil defense executive who asked Murrow to narrate an information film explained that he had picked Murrow because there are three voices in the United States that people really listen to – Bishop Sheen's, Arthur Godfrey's, and Ed Murrow's."[2] After he had left CBS in 1961 to become director of the United States Information Agency, even after his death in 1965, indeed well into the 1980s Murrow remains a legend. His legacy is part of the lure that CBS uses to catch and keep talented newscasters. Said CBS Evening News anchor Dan Rather, "Anytime they want to get their hand on your leg, they bring up Murrow."[3]

Murrow is considered by many to be the first serious practitioner of broadcast journalism as we know it today. He built up the first corps of network correspondents ("Murrow's boys") during World War II. They quickly established radio as an indispensible medium for news. His move to television in 1951 added professional credibility to the new medium. He pioneered in developing the television documentary form with "See It Now." "Person to Person" played a large part in popularizing the televised celebrity interview.

There is a shortage of well-researched academic material on Morrow's contributions to the fledgling television industry, and most of what exists deals almost exclusively with "See It Now," particularly his broadcasts dealing with McCarthyism and the second Red scare. Wrote Daniel J. Leab, "Most commentary about Murrow verges on hagiography, and [there is] little serious writing about him or his efforts that [do] not incline to the adulatory."[4]

What is often ignored or dismissed by television historians is that more people watched "Person to Person" than "See It Now." "To the majori-

ty of Americans in the 1950s, Murrow was principally known not as the crusading journalist on 'See It Now' but as the urbane 'houseguest' on 'Person to Person,' " noted Gary Paul Gates.[5] *Time* magazine, in a 1957 story, said that Murrow, "in his role of star on the trivial but popular "Person to Person," [is] one of TV's five top-rated entertainers."[6] Yet his historical reputation rests largely on the McCarthy telecasts and his radio broadcasts from London during World War II. Because of the emphasis placed on these by historians (and journalists), his television career and "persona" have not been represented clearly.

The Home Box Office docudrama "Murrow," released in January 1986, has been provoking a great deal of controversy. Many agreed with television columnist Gary Deeb that it is a dull portrayal "of the swashbuckling, almost romantic Murrow . . . a genuine hero who nearly always stood up for what was honorable and decent."[7] Such statements and characterization, while perhaps true, serve to obscure Murrow's real contributions to television journalism. Despite his production of many provocative and probing video segments, for example, for the most part he used television in a conservative manner — both "See It Now" and "Person to Person" were formulaic and as predictable as many other television programs.

Cultural critic Dwight Macdonald, in the early 1960s, derogatorily dubbed mass culture "Masscult," a "parody of High Culture . . . and the enormous output of such new media as the radio, television and the movies is almost entirely Masscult."[8] Masscult, Macdonald said, is an assembly line product which "asks nothing of its audience . . . and it gives nothing."[9] Television, in Macdonald's terms, could at best aspire to "midcult" status.

> Midcult has the essential qualities of Masscult — the formula, the built-in reaction, the lack of any standard except popularity — but it decently covers them with a cultural figleaf . . . it pretends to respect the standards of High Culture while in fact it waters them down and vulgarizes them.[10]

He mentions specifically only one television program, CBS's "Omnibus," and called it midcult. And even "Omnibus," with its supposedly high aspirations, was "aimed straight at the average American audience, neither highbrow or lowbrow, the audience that made the *Reader's Digest*, *Life*, the *Ladies' Home Journal*, the audience which is the solid backbone of any business as it is of America itself."[11] There seems little doubt that "See It Now" falls squarely into the same category as "Omnibus." "Person to Person" was just as surely "masscult," a commercial, assembly-line product. And as much as Murrow's admirers — and even critics — would like to forget it, he was co-producer and star of this program.

Macdonald also wrote, "Individuals are caught up in the workings of a mechanism that forces them into its own pattern; only heroes can resist, and while one can hope that everybody will be a hero, one cannot demand it."[12] A similar thing may be said to Murrow's admirers: It is okay to hope that he remains a hero all the time, but one cannot demand it. He too, was caught up in a cultural mechanism that was larger than himself. "Person to Person" perfectly illustrates the case for this argument.

Murrow was able to use television ably with "See It Now," but the demands of television were such that he had to abdicate much control of

"Person to Person" to his co-producers, John Aaron and Jesse Zousmer. He could not abdicate responsibility. He was the reason the program existed, he asked the questions of the interviewees. There is no evidence that CBS demanded that he do "Person to Person." He made a great deal of money from the program. He was, undeniably, a willing participant.

Several critics characterized his two programs as "highbrow" and "lowbrow" Morrow. Some, notably John Crosby and John Lardner of the *New Yorker* and Gilbert Seldes of the *Saturday Review*, criticized Murrow's involvement with "Person to Person," believing his participation in the program lowered the standards for television programming as a whole. Following the lead of these prominent contemporaries, Murrow's biographers and historians have similarly denigrated or dismissed "Person to Person" out of hand. Alexander Kendrick, in *Prime Time: The Life of Edward R. Murrow*, devotes little space to the program in his sprawling biography. He tries to minimize its importance, just as Murrow shrugged it off as something he did "to let Jesse and Johnny [Zousmer and Aaron] pick up some change."[13] Paradoxically, Murrow clearly understood that "Person to Person" gave him a popular base which allowed him to take financial and political liberties with "See It Now." Kendrick does not discuss the real and vital relationship between Murrow's two television roles, and the impact that Murrow's participation in "Person to Person" has had on television journalism.

Ann Sperber, in the recently released *Murrow: His Life and Times*, is somewhat more critical than Kendrick on other aspects of Murrow's life, but she too fails to take Murrow to task for his participation in the program. Indeed, she barely mentions it, devoting a mere 15 pages of the sprawling 700-plus page text to "Person to Person." This new book, touted by its publisher as a definitive work, also lacks any analysis of Murrow as a celebrity, performer, and popular culture icon. Though extremely detailed about even the most minor incidents in his life, and his most insignificant political views, *Murrow: His Life and Times*, is little more than a glorified filing cabinet, and the "Person to Person" file is largely missing.[14]

"Person to Person" played a major part in the emergence of television news as entertainment. Though Murrow was, wrote Henry Fairlie in the *New Republic*, "a master of the medium of radio . . . he could only be a pawn in the enterprise of television."[15] Yet those who criticized this program and Murrow's involvement in it judged him as somehow being separate from the structure of the television medium and culture that he was part of. It is unrealistic — and unfair — to hold Murrow to standards that simply did not fit the cultural arena and business he worked in. His television career begins to make sense once this culture is understood, and his wide-ranging popularity becomes even more fascinating.

This monograph will examine the general concepts behind Murrow's television programs, and how they became manifested in the product that viewers saw on their television screens twice a week. Both "See It Now" and "Person to Person" were geared to mass audiences, as the medium of television demanded. The audience for each program differed, as did Murrow's demeanor on each night.

Murrow's "See It Now" broadcasts concerning McCarthy and the second Red scare will not be discussed in detail, but their effects on his

reputation as a journalist and performer will be examined.[16] After these programs he became known as a crusading liberal, legend and ultimately, hero. It is this series of broadcasts that best exemplifies the side of Murrow that deeply needed to be recognized for the old-fashioned virtues of character, the side that emphasized substance over image. In contrast, his "Person to Person" interviews demanded that he be, above all, charming and likeable. That he was able to be successful in two programs that seemingly were so different is remarkable, and will be a subject of analysis after the general discussion of the two programs.

See It Now

Prior to its first broadcast on Sunday, November 18, 1951 at 3:30 p.m., CBS touted "See It Now" as "the ultimate sight-and-sound development" of the Murrow-Friendly documentary ideas.[17] Sponsored by the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa), "See It Now" would be a "news magazine of television" comprised of "personal interviews, overseas reports, biographical features, human-interest stories, documentary features, and late news breaks." Far-flung camera crews would utilize the most advanced video technologies to present "the news through the people who make the news."[18]

Although the format of "See It Now" would evolve and change slightly over the years, Murrow and Friendly had a clear conception of what they wanted to do. They decided, for example, to originate the program from the control room of Studio 41 in New York's Grand Central Terminal, rather than from a staged set. They did this to promote and accentuate the "realistic" elements of "See It Now," to separate it from the entertainment programs on television. Explained Murrow on that first broadcast,

> There was talk of originating in my office. Even this, they said, would have to be a duplication of my office and this seemed a bit phony. So, as an experiment, we have decided to try doing the show from where all television shows have to originate . . . the control room.[19]

Murrow believed portrayal of the "real" to be more interesting, exciting and important than the largely fictional entertainment programs that dominated television programming. Real people, places and events were intriguing and needed explanations. The technologies of television also interested Murrow, this being one reason for originating from the studio. "We thought you might like to watch us make these switches," he said, referring to the program's use of several different monitors and combinations of film and live material. "Some people take television for granted," he continued. "We, as novitiates, have never quite gotten over the miracle that makes this fantastic gadget operate." He then demonstated the potential of television by showing, on a split screen, live shots of the San Francisco Bay Bridge and the Brooklyn Bridge, and then the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. He concluded this demonstration by saying,

> . . . no journalistic age was ever given a weapon for truth with quite the scope of this fledgling television . . . We are aware of the electronic wonder entrusted to our fingers. As human beings, we only hope that we are up to it; as reporters we only hope that we

never abuse it.[20]

These statements *were not* simply empty rhetoric. Murrow did not make the move to television without a great deal of thought. His wariness of the new medium is reflected in his use of the word "gadget" to describe it. He never felt that television equalled radio as a means of transmitting news — it lacked the older medium's mobility. Almost paradoxically, though, Murrow had a sense of awe about television and its potential. He feared that television could serve as an extremely powerful amplified theater for the messages of a demagogue if it got in the wrong hands or was used without discrimination.

Murrow used television in a conservative manner, as exemplified by "See It Now" and later "Person to Person." He later became notorious for his controversial "See It Now" broadcasts dealing with McCarthy and the second Red scare, but most often the program steered away from clearly controversial issues. The approach resembled, noted Murray Russell Yaeger, "that of a movie newsreel presentation."[21] A story — including campaigns, elections, speeches, natural disasters and features of a less-than-serious nature — rarely merited more than ten minutes of air time. Some of the best and most popular broadcasts were those of a clearly sentimental and "human interest" nature, such as "Christmas in Korea" broadcast on December 29, 1953, and "A Visit To Flat Rock — Carl Sandburg" broadcast on October 5, 1954.[22]

"See It Now" was clearly the showcase news program on CBS. In the early and mid-fifties, the 15-minute evening news broadcast "was treated as a light, harmless throwaway by the networks," wrote Matusow. CBS's "Doug Edwards and the News" had few resources compared to "See It Now." Most at the network considered "See It Now" separate from the News Division, as it had a larger and more highly paid staff.[23]

With virtual autonomy within the network and editorial freedom granted by Alcoa, Murrow truly ran the show. This resulted from his power (as top newscaster and also member of the Board of Directors) and prestige, and also his close personal friendship with William S. Paley, CBS's Chairman of the Board. Paley and Murrow, friends since World War II, had grown closer over the years. Murrow rarely exercised his formal obligation to answer to Paley, and Paley rarely asked. Murrow also gained this autonomy from trust: though sometimes controversial and considered "left-leaning" by many, he had done little to offend radio listeners and had hardly abused his powers. Also, the network and Murrow did little to downplay this freedom, which enhanced his journalistic credibility at a time when video journalism was still considered a very poor cousin to radio.[24]

According to James L. Baughman, " 'See It Now' reflected an individualistic rather than a corporate talent,"[25] but Murrow and Friendly evenly split producing and administrative duties, also delegating some responsibilities to Palmer Williams.[26] In December 1953 Charles Weretenbaker explained that

> . . . the actual production . . . is pretty much in Friendly's hands until the Monday morning before it goes on the air. However, Murrow and Friendly map out each show at least a week in advance — and as much as several months in advance in the case of an occasional double-length show — and every morning they discuss the

progress of the subjects.[27]

With the 1953 season came dramatic changes for "See It Now." The program had dealt with few controversial subjects in its first two years. Relegated to the Sunday afternoon "ghetto," its ratings were never high. Murrow and Friendly changed the program's format, sometimes featuring only one subject rather than three or four. CBS switched "See It Now" to a 10:30 p.m. Tuesday time slot. The network did not risk much by giving the program time prime-time exposure, despite expected low ratings.[28] It not only brought more prestige to CBS, as critics approved of the network broadcasting a news documentary program in prime-time, but the program also entered a previously empty time slot. Rival networks filled the fringes of their schedules with weak programming.[29]

"See It Now" remained in this time slot for two years, but regular reviews by television columnists, awards and high acclaim failed to attract large audiences for the program.[30] A significant fact often overlooked by television historians is that many television owners simply did not get a chance to watch "See It Now." During the week of February 2, 1954, about a month before the "Report on Senator Joseph McCarthy," 33 per cent of the CBS affiliates did not "clear," or broadcast, the program, as compared to only six per cent that did not clear "Doug Edwards and the News."[31] This suggests that what the critics thought important and noteworthy did not necessarily correspond to the viewing audience's opinion. This is an important distinction, as critics continued to love "See It Now," and for the most part disdained "Person to Person," which was introduced in the fall 1953 season. Viewers, on the other hand, clearly preferred "Person to Person."

The "See It Now" broadcasts concerning questions of loyalty, subversion, internal security, investigating committees and McCarthy himself began in October 1953. Although not pre-planned as a "series," the connections between them are clear. Murrow drew similar implications from the stories presented and controversy followed each broadcast.

The five broadcasts that can be seen as Murrow's "attack" on McCarthyism are "The Case of Lt. Milo Radulovich," broadcast on October 20, 1953; "An Argument in Indianapolis," which appeared on November 24, 1953; "A Report on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy," broadcast March 9, 1954; "Annie Lee Moss Before the McCarthy Committee," which aired on March 16 1954; and "Senator McCarthy" (McCarthy's reply to Murrow), broadcast April 6, 1954.[32]

Until the Radulovich broadcast, these shows would have had to be classified as atypical. The use of the entire half-hour for each subject underscored their importance. It was Murrow's way of being sure that the points he wanted to make were backed up with substantial, credible material. By nature cautious, Murrow knew of the controversial nature of these five broadcasts and prepared the material carefully. He also prepared to defend himself against expected right-wing critics.

In the first "See It Now" Murrow spoke of his wonder of television and vowed not to abuse it. Some thought that he did so in these broadcasts. Indeed, some felt these broadcasts shortened Murrow's broadcasting career. This is debatable. It is clear, however, that he maintained his credibility *precisely because of* this cautious approach to confronting McCarthyism.

In 1955, after the passions that this series inspired had dissipated, his popularity peaked. While Murrow made some new enemies by attacking McCarthy on "See It Now," at the same time he made many new friends: the viewers of his increasingly popular "Person to Person" series, which premiered just a few weeks before the "The Case of Lt. Milo Radulovich." This newfound popularity gave Murrow an extra edge over McCarthy, a man arguably at the peak of *his* popularity during the first months of 1954.

These broadcasts broadened possibilities for the television documentary genre. A lull followed the cancellation of "See It Now" as a weekly series in 1955, but matters improved by the early sixties, when public affairs programming enjoyed a resurgence after the quiz scandals. Indeed, "See It Now" would be held as a standard in the years to come. But in 1953, the state of affairs looked dim. Remarked television critic Jack Gould in the *New York Times*,

> Nine out of ten documentaries on the air work themselves into a great fury of indignation over matters which there scarcely can be any argument . . . Similarly, radio and TV are inclined to add the weight of their influence to the resolution of an issue after the matter already has been more or less settled.[33]

Examination of the vital issues of McCarthyism and the second Red scare made these broadcasts different from those referred to by Gould.

In the post-World War II period, according to Gates, Ed Murrow "was a dedicated cold-warrior whose concern over the threat of Communism, at home and abroad, was as great as that of some of McCarthy's most loyal supporters."[34] Murrow clearly demonstrated his strong anti-communist feelings in 1951. He joined the "Committee on the Present Danger," which favored a buildup of American and allied military forces, and paraded under the slogan "Peace through Strength."[35] He also wrote an article for a special issue of *Collier's* devoted to a "Preview of the War We Do Not Want." The magazine intended "to warn the evil masters of the Russian people that *their* vast conspiracy to enslave humanity is the dark, downhill road to World War III."[36]

Yet his "public persona" did not betray his political beliefs. His television sponsor, Alcoa, found it necessary to ask Murrow what his politics were. He refused to reply.[37] *Newsweek* reported that "two fifths of his mail accused him of being pro-Ike," in March 1953, while "three fifths of his mail called him pro-Stevenson." The newsmagazine also quoted McCarthy in the same article as saying, "that he wished every radio and TV commentator were as fair as Ed Murrow."[38]

Some print reporters and broadcasters did speak out against McCarthy, wrote Michael Murray:

> Frequent attacks on McCarthy and his associates were made in editorial statements by Walter Lippmann, Joseph and Stewart Alsop, Marquis Childs, Drew Pearson, Thomas L. Stokes and in the cartoons of Herblock (Herbert Block). In addition to Murrow and Elmer Davis, broadcasters such as Quincy Howe, Martin Agronsky and Edward P. Morgan continually questioned McCarthy's methods and abuses.[39]

Such editorial attacks were risky. Agronsky, who in 1953 had a daily 15-minute news program for ABC radio, followed McCarthy closely in his broadcasts. As a result of his commentary, Edwin R. Bayley observ-

ed, he "lost more than half of his sponsors, to the point that neither he, the stations, nor the network were making money on his broadcasts."[40]

On "See It Now" and on radio, Murrow criticized McCarthy with caution. Direct and total condemnation of the man would not be safe nor necessarily effective. But McCarthy could be criticized indirectly by examining his means rather than his ends. On a "See It Now" broadcast in December 1951, for example, McCarthy was shown complaining that he had been "smeared" by other politicians. Murrow then showed a film clip of McCarthy attacking Owen Lattimore in a speech, and said, "It would appear that the difference between smearing and straightforward attack depends up on whose reputation is being gored."[41]

Murrow's statements against McCarthy and McCarthyism became stronger by 1953, though still infrequent and often qualified with reaffirmations of his strong anti-Communist feelings. On a radio broadcast in February 1953 he commented:

> So long as this nation is threatened by external foes and internal subversion we shall have with us the problem of the loyalty and reliability of people who work for the government. In the past, efforts have been made to determine loyalty and reliability by committees, review boards and by Congressional Committees. In the process the public mind has been confused, and personal reputations have been destroyed . . .[42]

Clearly troubled by McCarthy's growing power, Murrow hesitated to use his own power to combat it. His strong beliefs in civil liberties and the right of dissent clashed with his commitment to journalistic objectivity and the responsbility of the broadcaster to keep partisan political comment out of the news. He even had an "objectivity clause" written into his contract with CBS.[43]

Murrow's five broadcasts that concerned McCarthy and the second Red scare are often discussed as a series, although they were not planned together. These broadcasts have been reviewed more than adequately by Murrow's contemporaries and also by media historians. What the record suggests is that Murrow, although he was taking a risk by taking on McCarthy, had the support of many newspapers, politicians, and Alcoa and CBS. These broadcasts, as Gould said in referring to the Radulovich telecast, were undoubtedly "a long step forward in television journalism." He noted that it was the first time a major network and important sponsor "consented to a program taking a vigorous editorial stand in a matter of national importance and controversy."[44] The possibilities of the documentary genre seemed to broaden when five weeks later Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott vindicated Radulovich of the charges that he was a security risk, overturning the protested decision and allowing the Lieutenant to remain in his position.

The "Report on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy" aired at 10:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 9, 1954. Although viewed in only 2,394,000 homes, a small audience even then for prime-time television, its impact greatly surpassed that of any television program up until that time.[45] After Murrow's brief introduction, during which he offered McCarthy time to reply on a future broadcast, the program consisted, said *Newsweek*, of brilliantly juxtaposed film clips of McCarthy "belching, laughing at this own jokes ('Alger, I mean Adlai'), contradicting himself, and ignoring witnesses before his subcommittee." Separating the clips were

understated comments and corrections of McCarthy's lies by Murrow.[46]

Finally, Murrow concluded, reading carefully from his script:

> It is necessary to investigate before legislating, but the line between investigation and persecuting is a very fine one and the junior senator from Wisconsin has stepped over it repeatedly . . .
>
> This is no time for men who oppose Senator McCarthy's methods to keep silent, or for those who approve. We can deny our heritage and our history but we cannot escape responsibility for the result . . . The actions of the junior senator from Wisconsin have caused alarm and dismay amongst our allies abroad and given considerable comfort to our enemies, and whose fault is that. Not really his, he didn't create this situation of fear, he merely exploited it and rather successfully. Cassius was right, 'The fault, dear Brutus is not in our stars, but in ourselves.'[47]

The strong and immediate audience response surprised even Murrow and Friendly. Seconds after the program ended, Don Hollenbeck said on the 11 o'clock news Channel 2, "I don't know whether all of you have seen what I just saw, but I want to associate myself and this program with what Ed Murrow has just said, and I have never been prouder of CBS!"[48] Calls flooded the CBS switchboard, and telegrams and letters poured in during the next few days. Most of this response favored Murrow; CBS reported on March 11 that 12,348 telephone calls and telegrams had been received, 11,567 favoring Murrow against only 781 for McCarthy. The network received 22,000 letters by the month's end, 19,500 backing Murrow.[49]

Many newspapers, including the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and the *New York Herald Tribune*, lauded Murrow in the editorial pages and the television columns. Gould wrote, "It was crusading journalism of high responsibility and genuine courage, and credited CBS and Alcoa for "enlightened citizenship," in support of the program.[50]

Many expected McCarthy's reply on "See It Now" to be a polished and harsh attack of Murrow; instead, the Senator produced a shoddily filmed speech. Three maps of the world and a wooden pointer served as his only props. Although he did attack Murrow, much of what he said had nothing to do with the "See It Now" broadcast of March 9. He did "charge" that Murrow had "sponsored a Communist school in Moscow," and "was engaged in propaganda for Communist causes." He falsely claimed that Murrow was a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, "a terrorist organization cited as subversive by an attorney general of the United States." For the most part, McCarthy repeated many of the same "charges" that had been made in *Counterattack*, including the *Daily Worker's* "praise" of Murrow and "See It Now." The bulk of the broadcast consisted of a lecture on the world history of the spread of Communism. Using the maps, he pointed out how Communism had spread from a small group of men in England just a hundred years previous, to now taking up "over one-third of the earth's area." And how did so many people come under Communist influence? "They were delivered, delivered to Communist slave masters by the jackal pack of Communist-line propagandists, including the friends of Mr. Edward R. Murrow."[51]

After McCarthy's response, publicity surrounding these broadcasts diminished considerably. The Army-McCarthy hearings began in late

April, and the daily coverage on the ABC and DuMont networks contributed a great deal to the Senator's downfall. By the end of 1954 he had been censured by the Senate and his political career was doomed.

Murrow exhibited some bravery in his battle with McCarthy, but it must be emphasized that others had also defended themselves while under attack by the Senator. As Murrow said later that summer,

> A lot of men in this country who can write much better than I do were attacking McCarthy long before I got into the act. I don't see, really, why our show about him caused so much hullaballoo. Nor do I see why anybody who happens to take a crack at what McCarthy stands for should be regarded as unusually brave.[52]

Murrow had strong resources: a nightly radio news show, "See It Now," and the great popularity of "Person to Person."[53] Many people who enjoyed the Friday night program simply could not believe that the harmless Murrow they saw on this program, the Murrow they remembered from his World War II radio broadcasts, could be as awful a person as McCarthy made him out to be, much less a communist-sympathizer. Also, during this period Alcoa and CBS stood firmly behind Murrow, despite rumors of private misgivings.[54] These resources would prove strong enough to defeat McCarthy, but the outcome at the time was far from certain.

Did Murrow make a personal sacrifice? Had he meant to place himself in the role of liberal leader, a crusader for a cause? It is doubtful. Although obviously politically-minded, he had little political ambition.[55] Though decidedly liberal on many issues — especially those concerning civil liberties — what he wanted most was a large viewing audience, not a constituency. He prided himself on being a bit of a political chameleon, on his reputation for keeping his personal politics private. Indeed, this played a large part in giving his McCarthy broadcasts the public legitimacy they enjoyed. Coming farther from the left, the impact would not have been the same.

Murrow conducted himself during this period of high visibility and controversy in a studied, cautious and low-key manner. He let it be known that he was surprised at the impact of the McCarthy broadcast, signalling that he had not intended to crusade. One viewing the McCarthy broadcast does not really feel that Murrow is "out to get" McCarthy. The judgments made are not those of a zealot, although they are clearly meant to right McCarthy's wrong.[56]

During the broadcast Murrow even seemed apologetic for having to deal with the subject. This made his appeal even more sincere. Said one reviewer, "The judgments are voiced in tones which have been compared with those which might be expected of the Deity, but they usually have the human disclaimer, "it would seem to this reporter . . ."[57] Such a line served as a useful oratorical device: Murrow would *seem* to be putting himself on the same level as the viewer, and had even convinced himself of this. The audience did not feel talked down to; Murrow presented himself, wrote Wertenbaker, "as something between the breathless messenger and the sagacious pundit."[58]

Murrow had resources at his disposal which the audience did not. It was just one man's opinion, but it was no secret that this man had a large staff, four or five camera crews at his disposal, a huge budget, and contacts with many of the world's political leaders. The average viewer did

not dispute his opinion as a matter of trust, observed Norman Swallow in *Factual Television.* Murrow's "concern was to find out the facts on behalf of the viewer, and to let nothing and nobody stand in his way."[59]

Person to Person

Motives are the great unknown, the bane of historian and biographer. It is far easier to tell when and how a person acts than *why.* Even interviews with and statements by the individuals involved must be dealt with in context and scrutinized. This holds true when trying to determine Murrow's motives for hosting "Person to Person." David Halberstam argued that Murrow "made a deliberate decision to make himself more palatable to the public."[60] This is unlikely. Of all the things that drove the broadcaster to success, the desire to be a star was not one of them. Yet "Person to Person" certainly played a role in, said *Variety* in February 1954, the "emergence of Murrow as a major tv personality on his own."[61]

Murrow felt ambivalent about participating in the program. At times he enjoyed it, and indeed he defended the program when challenged within the network or by critics. At other times "clearly embarrassed"[62] about his role in the show, he explained that "to do the show I want to do, I have to do the show that I don't want to do."[63] Perhaps he said this to placate Friendly and Frank Stanton, both opponents of Murrow's involvement in "show business," but there is little doubt that hosting the popular interview program did give him more leverage when dealing with the network on behalf of "See It Now."[64]

Few anticipated the success of "Person to Person." *Variety,* in 1954, reported that the program "looms as the 'sleeper of the year,' " because "both Murrow and the network embarked last fall with something approaching trepidation, for nobody knew what the 'remote interview' idea would add up to."[65] In the 1950s there were no sure winners on television, no formulas guaranteeing success. Scheduled in the fringes of prime time (10:30 p.m. on Friday nights), the program relied heavily on the luster of Murrow's "name" and weak competition from rival networks. Many stations would not even pick up the network feed at that time, making ratings success an uphill battle at best.

Each "Person to Person" broadcast consisted of two interviews, usually with celebrities, originating from the guests' home. Murrow posed during the live broadcasts, said co-producer Johnny Aaron, "as a polite guest."[66] This prevented embarrassment and made production easier. The elaborate setup, described below, made it necessary to provide scripted questions to the guests prior to the broadcast. These served as cues for the interviewee to move from place to place.

Production of each week's program was a complex task. Before scheduling a show, engineers had to confirm the possibility of live transmission from the interviewee's home, which often entailed installation of a microwave relay transmitter on top of the building. With that decision made and the agreement of the interviewee (who was not paid) secured, the "Person to Person" crew went to work. It was, reported Val Adams of the *New York Times,* "comparable to throwing the parlor open to Barnum & Bailey." Twelve or so technicians appeared several days before the broadcast to set up, bringing with them between two and

five cameras, ten stage lights, and a portable control room (packed in 20 suitcases). Rugs were taken up and doors removed from hinges. Surprisingly few guests seemed to mind the invasion. "After each show, the head of the house breaks out food and drink" for the technicians. And by the next day, said co-producer Jesse Zousmer, "we have put back everything just like we found it. And we always tip the maid to do any necessary cleaning the next morning."[67]

Like many other television programs in the fifties, "Person to Person" could be described as an experiment.[68] The original format, Murrow's unusual role as friendly guest, and the technologies used to broadcast from an individual's home were all previously untested. Two technological elements that dominated production of "Person to Person," the wireless microphone and the "picture window," are taken for granted today but at the time were unusual and considered trademarks of the program.

The "picture window" created the illusion that Murrow, sitting in the studio, looked through a window and into the interviewee's home. Technically this is called "matting through a frame," and "Person to Person" was probably the first network show ever to use this technique with a live picture.[69] Paley originally opposed its use and advised Murrow to eliminate it, instead simply telling viewers "That you are going to have a visit through the use of television cameras 'now set up and ready' in Mr. Blank's house."[70] Murrow ignored the advice and defended "Person to Person's" exclusive use of the picture window.

A memo he wrote to Sig Mickelson in November 1954 was unusually passionate:

> I was quite distressed on Tuesday night to find that our election coverage on television was employing the 'picture window' device which PERSON TO PERSON first introduced and which has become as much of a trademark for us as 'the bursting stars' are to Gleason or the 'dancing chorus line' is to the Sullivan show . . . This may be regarded as of small import to some, but to us this represented an inexcusable case of complete disregard of our desire to protect what we consider an essential element of the PERSON TO PERSON show.[71]

This memo refutes the common wisdom that Murrow did not really care that much about "Person to Person," that he appeared on the program primarily to make himself more popular or to make money. His commitment to the show went beyond these superficial concerns. He passionately opposed suggestions that the show be broadcast on kinescope to certain cities where it would or could not be picked up live. As the program increased in popularity, the program's sponsors (Amoco in the east, Hamm Brewing in the midwest) increased pressure to allow rebroadcasts. This could potentially increase the number of affiliates broadcasting "Person to Person" from 37 to 105 or more, which would subsequently boost ratings and hence the money-making potential of the program.[72] Yet Murrow refused under any arrangements, saying that "we make considerable play on the air about this program being live, and I feel very strongly that running it on a delayed basis anywhere . . . would make us look just plain ridiculous." He felt that the illusion of spontaneity accounted for much of the program's appeal.[73]

As with "See It Now," "realness" of the situation was emphasized. On

the premier broadcast, Murrow said, "Now this is really an ordinary studio in midtown Manhattan. We have no applause meter. We have no jack pot. We have no audience. We have no scripts." The program aimed not to dazzle, but to show the viewer "some interesting people doing usual things."[74] Technologies continued to be emphasized, however, with the new capability to broadcast live from "the coast" highlighted in 1954,[75] and "the fastest film processing and delivery schedule that can be arranged" was utilized to broadcast a kinescope of a 1955 "Person to Person" interview with Harry Truman on the BBC within 48 hours of being telecast live in the States.[76]

Murrow's influence on the program is indicated by the guests who appeared. The co-producers arranged talks with politicians, government figures, lawyers, writers, academics, and others who did not usually have their names in lights to complement the parade of "show business" (primarily television and movie stars) personalities interviewed. Zousmer and Aaron, who arranged the specific pairings for each show, enjoyed setting up unlikely pairs to share the half-hour: Marilyn Monroe and Sir Thomas Beecham, Sophie Tucker and Judge Harold R. Medina, Eva Gabor and Krishna Menon, Tallulah Bankhead and Theodore White, Benny Goodman and Justice William O. Douglas.[77] This underscored the theme of the show, that once the lights go down or the book is published people are all really the same.

Brooklyn Dodger catcher Roy Campanella and symphony conducter Leopold Stokowski were the first "Person to Person" guests, on October 2, 1953. Campanella proved a good choice. The National League leader that season in runs batted in, on the afternoon of the broadcast he hit a home run in the first game of the World Series to lead the Dodgers to victory over the Yankees. The conversation between Murrow and Campanella, after an exchange about the home run and his recent hand injury, became stilted. Campanella in his den, picked up an "eight ball" which could make predictions when queried, which Murrow proceeded to do:

> CAMPANELLA: Okay, go right ahead.
> MURROW: Who is going to win the game tomorrow?
> CAMPANELLA: Well, I will shake it and see. The answer, "Cannot predict now," and that's true.
> MURROW: Is that your answer too?
> CAMPANELLA: Well, yes. We have to play first before you can predict what will happen tomorrow.
> MURROW: Roy, you have had a tough break getting hit on the hand in that first game. You have had the best season that a catcher has ever had. You have had good days and bad days. You are the hero of a lot of kids. What would you say to them about adversity and tough times and how to meet them?
> CAMPANELLA: Well, just always try to play a clean game. It's a wonderful thing to play any sport and play it right and I tell you reading your Bible means quite a bit too.[78]

In his review of the first broadcast, Gould criticized both the tone of the interviews and the proposed format of the show. Referring to the interview with Stokowskis, he deplored the evident "stiffness and formality" and said that "the motivation behind the show should be a casual call, not a state visit." Despite this and other problems, he saw hope for

the program, but only if it could change its proposed formula of concentrating on famous personalities:

> Television is already too celebrity-conscious. 'Person to Person' will be missing a real bet for fascinating viewing if it does not, at least ocassionally, give some time to individuals who are not household names. The unsung doctor, teacher, chorus girl, construction worker, store-keeper, and Wall Street clerk also could make absorbing interviews.[79]

Murrow, too, felt that only by bringing "ordinary" people onto the program could "Person to Person" fulfill its potential as a good, innovative program. Only occassionally, however, did an "unknown" appear on the broadcast. By the time the program had established itself and achieved high ratings, the formula was too set to tamper with. People tuned in every Friday night to peek into celebrities' home — if they wanted to see the homes of ordinary people, they could just go next door.

Zousmer and Aaron scheduled guests with an indisputable *elan*. While some well-known guests raised high expectations and subsequently fell short of the mark, other more obscure guests provided many interesting moments. In the spring of 1954 Murrow interviewed Emmett Kelly, a clown with Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus. During the interview, as he answered questions about circus life, Kelly slowly applied his tragic clown's makeup, creating an interesting effect and adding, wrote *Variety*, a "clever visual factor to the running gab."[80] In September of that same year Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, his wife, and their six children "staged an informal musicale that ended with hymn singing," observed a *Look* reporter. On an earlier broadcast, he added, a struggling young actor named Bill McCutcheon and his wife "Showed Murrow through their tiny home as though it were a Fifth Avenue mansion."[81]

One could never be sure how each interview would turn out. Although the viewer knew who the scheduled guest would be in advance, from week to week the quality of the program varied. This was sometimes the fault of the guests, sometimes Murrow's. Said *Variety*:

> Ed Murrow has had pros before on 'Person to Person' but more than one froze up like a Frigidaire in an igloo when it came to humanizing themselves in their quarter-hour voluntary exposes of their pseudo-private lives. Some erred the other way, being so gayly abandoned as to dissipate the intime values that 'P-to-P' suggests.[82]

Murrow's clumsy interviewing resulted in an awkward half-hour with two potentially excellent subjects, Clarence Pickett and Marlon Brando. "By anything but adroit questioning by a heavy approach and fumbling faulty manner, Murrow spoiled [the interviews], jumping around from the important to the trivial with little discrimination," commented one reviewer. He sometimes interrupted the guest for little reason. For example, after questioning Pickett about U.S.-Soviet relations, he cut the Quaker's answer short and followed up with a question about his gardening.[83]

The live broadcast and assorted technical difficulties caused some of this awkwardness, but Murrow's inability to ad-lib exacerbated the problem. The predetermined line of questioning inhibited Murrow's ability to ask follow-up questions. Often, he would clearly not be listening to the

guest, responding to a joke or humorous anecdote with an obviously forced chuckle. But viewers did not seem to mind. The program grew in popularity from year to year, even though the show did not appear to improve.

The uneven quality of the interviews is evident in several of the broadcasts. Three are discussed below: October 30, 1953, with Senator John F. Kennedy and former North Korean P.O.W. William Dean; March 12, 1954 (three days after "See It Now's Report on Senator Joseph McCarthy") with RCA chief David Sarnoff and Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey; and September 3, 1954, with actors Humphrey Bogart and Lauren Bacall and composer Alex Templeton.[84]

This is a fairly representative sampling of "Person to Person" guests, although none of these broadcasts had a contrast in the guests that supposedly made many half-hours memorable.

There was, though, quite a range in the quality of the interviews, and even during each interview there were very good moments and very poor ones.

The opening of the October 30, 1953 broadcast is typical. As Murrow introduced John F. Kennedy, the viewer saw Murrow, slouched in an easy chair, leaning to his left, with a cigarette in his left hand and smoke swirling upward. Murrow then looked at the picture window, with the Kennedy's shown in their Boston apartment, sitting uncomfortably on a couch. Murrow is then out of the picture, and the viewer sees only the Kennedys, with Murrow questioning them off-camera.

Although some criticized "Person to Person" for lacking substance, Murrow usually tried to ask a few questions of significance. During the Kennedy interview, Murrow asked Kennedy about the Taft-Hartley Law and also about the nation's readiness for an all-out war. Kennedy, expecting these questions, responded with long, speech-like answers. Murrow did not even attempt to probe his answers. At one point, while the Senator discussed the Taft-Hartley law, Mrs. Kennedy returned after having left the room. She carried a football, a wedding present from Jim Fowler, overseer of athletic equipment at Harvard. Evidently of some import, Kennedy said a line or two about the football. But an impatient Murrow quickly changed the subject again with a question about the economy. This dialogue followed:

> KENNEDY: If we start to slip in a recession we will have to reduce taxes and reduce government spending, but savings are at an all-time high now. In fact I think we are infinitely better off than in 1920.
>
> MURROW: I understand you had a lot of tea parties during your campaign. Are you still able to drink tea?
>
> KENNEDY: Yes, I drank it then, and I think I learned to like it.[85]

This strange shift in questioning indicated Murrow's uncertainty in his role. If this had been a "See It Now" interview, the talk would have undoubtedly remained serious and Kennedy would have been taken to task on several of the points he made. The total effect is to leave the viewer with little insight into Kennedy: one is not sure whether this has just been a segmented stump speech or an attempt to portray the Senator as a normal person.

The second half of this broadcast, the interview with former P.O.W. General Dean, had some compelling moments. In his introduction of the

General, Murrow spoke of Dean being awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, with a citation for attacking an enemy tank single-handedly with a hand grenade, and "for the leadership and courageous devotion to his men and a complete disregard for his personal safety." This exchange followed brief greetings:

> MURROW: General, while you were in that prison you probably had more time to think than any man in the armed services in the last few years. What particularly did you worry about?
> DEAN: My greatest concern was the sense of my inadequacy, of my failure during the 20 days that I fought before I was captured. I felt that we hadn't stopped the North Koreans because of my own inadequacy.
> MURROW: Then you didn't expect to return home, if you ever did, as a hero with a Congressional Medal of Honor?
> DEAN: No, anything but that. I expected when I returned that I might even be tried for not having done better, for not having fulfilled my obligations to my country.[86]

The General came across as sincere, warm and emotional; Murrow's mediocre follow-up questions could not interfere with this. Often, good reviews of "Person to Person" would mention the guest's warmth and openness, and at best mention that Murrow did not get in the way of the guest's interaction with the audience. Sometimes, however, Murrow received praise for conducting a good interview.

The Dean interview did not consist of harmless fluff — which some accused "Person to Person" of being. Both Murrow and Dean strongly condemned the North Koreans and Communism, and Dean showed and discussed photographs of women and soldiers murdered by the North Koreans. A more touching moment was visual: while being asked about the conditions he had to endure as a prisoner, the General went and sat cross-legged on the floor, as he had for the past three years in his cell. Evidently more comfortable in this position than in a chair, he also seemed more serene. This kind of spontaneity could only have been achieved with the General being interviewed in his own home.[87]

Nearly six months later, David Sarnoff and George Humphrey appeared on "Person to Person." These quests differed from Kennedy, Dean and the usual "show biz" guests. The politics surrounding the broadcast provided the most interesting elements. It was March 12, 1954, three days after the "Report on Senator Joe McCarthy." Although Murrow did receive a great deal of support and public backing by ABC and NBC (a rare occurrence of mutual support by the networks), some speculated that the guests might back down from their commitments because of the controversy surrounding Murrow. Obviously they did not, leaving "Person to Person" seemingly unaffected by the Murrow-McCarthy dispute. (Apparently only once, when Atomic Energy Commissioner Lewis L. Strauss cancelled a scheduled "Person to Person" appearance because of Murrow's sympathetic interview with Robert Oppenheimer on "See It Now" in January 1955, did the two programs directly conflict. Oppenheimer, recently stripped of his security clearance by the government, was *persona non grata* in official Washington.)[88]

Sarnoff's appearance on "Person to Person" provoked some controversy because of his position as Chairman of the Board of RCA, with

subsidiary NBC being CBS's chief competitor. This interview made public Sarnoff and Murrow's mutual regard, causing some to speculate that Murrow might switch networks to NBC. Rumors circulated that Sarnoff would give up RCA's patent on magnetic color tape in exchange for CBS's cooperation if they would allow Murrow to break his contract.[89]

Murrow did little to discourage these rumors, and for the next year or so would encourage them by featuring many more NBC stars than CBS stars on "Person to Person." In November 1954, CBS even forced Murrow to cancel a scheduled appearance as host of an NBC special on the Overseas Press Club, feeling, noted *Variety*, "that Murrow was putting it in an embarrassing position by his appearance on a competing network." After this the rumors dissipated, as Murrow added more balance to the "Person to Person" schedule.[90]

The "Person to Person" broadcast with the Sarnoff and Humphrey interviews contrasted with the tense and serious "See It Now" broadcasts sandwiched around it. Murrow had been through a rough three days since his video confrontation with McCarthy, and in a few more days would do the "Annie Lee Moss" broadcast on "See It Now." Yet for the brief period of time Murrow appeared on-camera during this half-hour, he looked relaxed, well-rested, and had a lighter tone than usual in his voice. Even though he attempted to attach an air of factuality and seriousness to these interviews, the effect missed as, while slouching in his easy chair, Murrow tossed the guests easy questions.[91]

The Sarnoff and Humphrey interviews were fairly awkward. Both guests gave long, seemingly rehearsed answers to the obviously anticipated questions, and Murrow made little effort to explore interesting aspects of those speeches. Murrow asked Sarnoff, the great media magnate, how he got his start in radio, and Sarnoff told of his humble start as a messenger boy and wireless operator. This line of questioning followed:

> MURROW: General Sarnoff, where is that famous telegraph key?
> SARNOFF: Are you referring to the Titantic key?
> MURROW: Yes sir.
> SARNOFF: Well, here it is.
> MURROW: We will see if we can get in closer.
> SARNOFF: This is the key that I used when I was a wireless operator on the roof of the Wanamaker Building in 1912 at the time of the Titantic disaster. In these days you see we used very big and heavy keys but they didn't accomplish as much as the little keys of today.
> MURROW: Must have been quite a moment when you were handling that copy.
> SARNOFF: It was rather dramatic to be receiving the names of the survivors and to be able to give them to an anxious world.[92]

Murrow did not then ask what it was like, *how* it was dramatic, but rather changed the subject, asking Sarnoff about his friendship with Marconi. He had missed an obviously good story because he stuck steadfastly to his script.

It is unclear if technical problems plagued "Person to Person" in its later years, but during both the Sarnoff-Humphrey and the Bogarts-Templeton broadcasts they did little to add to the intended illusion of

this being a regular visit to the guests' home. Whenever Sarnoff moved, for example, his jacket brushed against the microphone, creating a static-like sound. In the middle of the interview, as the General moved down a long, winding staircase to join his wife, both audio and visual contact broke for about a minute, creating a strange silence. There was also a noticeable echo early in the Bogart interview, with Murrow's voice picked up both on his own microphone in the studio and Bogart's and Bacall's microphones at their home (Murrow's voice came from speakers hidden on the wall). Lauren Bacall wore tight pants during her appearance with Bogart, and was constantly fiddling with the battery pack around her waist. The audience evidently did not mind these technical problems and Murrow's awkward attempts to create the illusion of actually visiting the person's home ("I think the Humphreys are home now, so let's go in and see them"). "Person to Person's" ratings steadily climbed.[93]

The Humphrey interview proved uneventful, consisting mostly of inept banter about Mrs. Humphrey's needlepoint and scattered economic pep-talks by the Secretary of the Treasury.[94] *Variety* commented that "Both the Humphreys and Sarnoffs made agreeable impressions as warm, honest, everyday human beings."[95]

The Bogart and Bacall interview was alternately interesting and labored. Murrow and guests usually stumbled through the necessary introductions, and this interview proved no exception. The show opened up with Bacall on the sofa with her pet dogs. After a couple of minutes of talk about a bracelet Bogart had given Bacall Murrow asked:

MURROW: Where is the gift giver, Bogey?
BACALL: Oh, the gift giver is inside. Do you want to see him?
MURROW: Yes.
BACALL: Right.
MURROW: Good evening, Humphrey.
BOGART: Evening, Ed.
MURROW: How are you?
BOGART: Oh, I'm pretty good.

With the banal introduction out of the way, a more lively exchange between the three followed:

MURROW: I remember both of you are natives of New York. Do you miss the big town very much?
BOGART: No.
BACALL: Yes.
MURROW: Wait a minute. Well, that's a nice, normal family disagreement but tell me, don't either of you get a yen to do a Broadway play?
BACALL: Yes I do.
BOGART: No. I think — I tell you what I think — that you are going to run into a kind of traffic jam if you ask two actors one question. I think you better ask us one by one.[96]

Murrow took the advice, and the interview had some more interesting moments. Bogart said that he liked "type casting" because "I think it makes stars out of people and I think it gains the attention of people because I was a tough guy, because I shot people and killed people." He also admitted that he liked his pictures to be both good and to make money, and that he did not think the two ends were mutually exclusive.

This interview, said *Variety*, "resulted in a top 'Person' program."[97]

The previous April, "Person to Person" had decisively defeated its Friday night competition, the "Gillette Calvacade of Sports" boxing matches and "Down You Go," a quiz program, in the Trendex ratings.[98] During the 1954-55 season, "Person to Person" would be a consistent winner in the ratings game, despite its poor time slot. Although only about forty stations picked up the program at first, by December 1954 the total rose to 70[99] and in early January, 87. This latter total, reported *Variety*, was "regarded as 'impossible' when the Ed Murrow-hosted stanza premiered,"[100] but would grow much larger over the next few years. Both "See It Now" and "Person to Person" gave "CBS a monied advantage, building network audiences where they have seldom been built before."[101]

It is unclear why CBS did not place "Person to Person" more favorably. Murrow had attempted to move both of his programs into earlier-evening time slots.[102] Some would later argue that the network consciously tried to reduce Murrow's personal influence following the McCarthy dispute.[103] This is possible, but it is more likely that they were content to let the program continue to prosper in the previously useless time slot. There seemed little reason to tamper with a loyal audience and unexpected success.

On December 3, 1954, "Person to Person" broke into the "Trendex Top 10" for the first time, finishing in ninth place, ahead of Bob Hope's show. The "special marquee dazzle" of the guests, Bing Crosby and Mary Margaret McBride, seemed responsible, wrote one reviewer. Althouth the program would not consistently finish among the top ten, it would break through occassionally and remained especially popular considering its weak position in the schedule.[104]

It is unlikely that anyone other than Murrow would have been able to get all of "Person to Person's" famous guests to appear for no fee — many normally commanded $5,000 for such an appearance.[105] Zousmer and Aaron did most of the hard work, but the Murrow name added a certain lure. Once the program had established a good reputation and a large weekly viewing audience, guests also became attracted by the chance to sell their current or upcoming project — be it a film, television show, book, or political campaign. Early in the program's existence, *Variety* mentioned "a threat . . . that this show is being used for plugs" as guests Tallulah Bankhead and Theodore White "laid somewhat heavily on their books."[106] The producers cleared up this problem quickly, however, holding the guests to a limited discussion of only one project. When Bogart was scheduled to appear, for example, "three film companies started a behind-the-scenes battle for picture plugs." Bogart chose to mention "The Barefoot Contessa."[107]

As the list of V.I.P. guests on the program grew, it became a status symbol to appear on the show. "In the film communities of Beverly Hills and Bel Air, children of families that have been televisited by 'Person to Person' now look down their noses at schoolmates who have not been tapped," *Look* reported.[108] Even former President Truman allowed himself to be interviewed by daughter Margaret (Murrow was in London covering a British election) from the porch of his home in Independence, Missouri.[109]

The president and Mrs. Truman were obviously familiar with the pro-

gram and how they were expected to conduct themselves, reported the *New York Times*:

> As the program opened, Mr. and Mrs. Truman were seated in aluminum porch chairs. When Miss Truman would ask 'Mother' or 'Mommy' a question, Mrs. Truman would reply with little movement.
>
> However, when she said 'Daddy,' the former President, who had sat quietly before, immediately began rocking vigorously and continued to do so throughout his reply. Frequently the squeaking of the metal served as an accompaniment to his remarks.[110]

By this time, mid-1955, Murrow had become a "cultural folk figure," wrote Kendrick. Magazine cartoons, jokes on the television programs and humorous newspaper columns poked fun at the program. The English language expanded, as "Murrow became kind a kind of generic noun, instead of a proper name — 'he thinks he's a regular Murrow' — and was even used as a verb, 'to Murrow,' meaning to engage in social chitchat."[111] Murrow and "Person to Person" attracted the largest audience of women among all television shows. The serious journalist had become a sex symbol.[112]

Despite its popularity "Person to Person" still managed to attract heavy criticism from some quarters. In a 1957 cover story on Murrow *Time* managed to both lambast and laud the program, calling it "trivial but popular," and quoting a "frequent viewer" as saying the program had an "idiot fascination." Murrow remained untainted by the "insipid conversations he conducts," however. "The combination of brains, integrity, attractiveness, and showmanship that makes him such an effective journalist also establishes Murrow, in his role of star [and] as one of TV's five top-rated entertainers."[113]

Many of Murrow's interviews left much to be desired. *Time* noted Murrow's inability on both "See It Now" and "Person to Person" to follow up on interesting but unexpected responses from interviewees. The questions were obviously prearranged.[114] John Lardner later attributed the woodenness of Murrow's "Person to Person" interviews to their conscious frivolity:

> These breezy visits, in which he apparently hangs suspended in a chair outside his host's front windows, are plainly harder on him than they are on the audience. His mind, to judge by his work in general, is naturally of a grim, didactic cast, and he is most at home when the tone of discourse is serious, if not downright sinister. In such circumstances, his thoughts seem to flow easily, his morale seems to soar, and his talk is fluent and plausible. When the tone is commercially jocular . . . or demurely philoprogenitive . . . the sufferings of this grave spirit become — or so the sympathetic viewer feels — intense.[115]

"Person to Person" did not change much over the years, and neither did the weighty and continuous criticisms by Murrow's friend and admirer, Gilbert Seldes, television critic of the *Saturday Review*. In 1953, after viewing the first few broadcasts, he declared that Murrow had gone "thoroughly wrong" with the program. Commenting on Murrow's characterization of "Person to Person" as "an essay in transportation," Seldes said, "the amazing thing was not that the machinery had failed to take us places; it was that the people who lived in these places weren't

there either."[116]

Seldes' major criticism concerned Murrow's involvement with the program rather than the program itself. Aware of the banality of much television fare at the time, Seldes simply expected more from him, and felt that viewers had come to look to Murrow for intelligent programming. "It is quite possible that the Murrow program has no intention to bring us . . . substance," he wrote, "But Mr. Murrow is too good to evade the obligations of his own instruments; he is too good to use them for purposes that go against their nature."[117]

Seldes had little affection for the "low brow" material that constituted most of television programming. To him it implied a disrespect for the viewer and a misuse of the medium. His rhetoric held Murrow up to his own stated standards, that of using the powerful mechanisms of television responsibly, to portray things "as they really are." Almost five years later, Seldes elaborated on this in a letter to Zousmer and Aaron:

> I've never seen one person on the program (except Krishna Menon) who came off as an impressive human being and . . . every guest I've myself known has been from 25 to 50% less of a human being, a total person, than I've known him or her to be . . . I think the drive and emphasis of your program tends to make people trivial."[118]

This hit right at the heart of Murrow's vision of his job as reporter. The all-important individual served as his "prism" through which he saw the world and tried to portray it on radio and television. Even early broadcasts from London included such fare as "Experiences of a London Cabby and Impressions of Americans by Herbert Hodge" and "Saturday Night in the Spread Eagle Pub at Little Barfield, Sussex."[119] Murrow aimed not to trivialize but to put people on the same level. "Person to Person" was, indeed, a weekly he's-just-like-you-and-me celebrity profile. To trivialize the guest was to trivialize the viewer.

There may have been a more effective way to keep the formula the same but alter the emphasis to provide more substantial interviews, but the names and personalities provided most of the appeal of the program. Zousmer, Aaron and Murrow probably assumed that a more probing and challenging line of questioning would have kept many guests from appearing, expecially gratis. The demands of television necessitated a constant supply of big name guests for the program to maintain high ratings. At the same time, the viewer had to be assured that "host" Murrow would remain consistent from week to week, would ask familiar questions and keep the same "tone" to his demeanor.

Murrow never grasped the distinction between people and "personalities." He concerned himself with the former, while television demanded the latter. Somehow he resolved the obvious contradictions between the depiction of "reality" on "See It Now" as compared to "Person to Person." Not only did he adapt himself to the demands of each, but the public came to accept his performances on "Person to Person" as unaffected. But while the success of "Person to Person" continued to grow, "See It Now" began to falter.

Murrow: The Journalist as 'Masscult Personality'

One of the basic troubles with radio and television news is that both

> instruments have grown up as an incompatible combination of show business, advertising, and news. Each of the three is a rather bizarre and demanding profession. And when you get all three under one roof, the dust never settles.[120] — Edward R. Murrow

> Television personality knows no rules, except that it must somehow strike a spark 'somewhere out there.'[121] — Alexander Kendrick

Alcoa terminated its sponsorship of "See It Now" at the end of the 1954-55 season, and CBS was unable to find a sponsor for the program on a weekly basis. Paley suggested that Murrow and Friendly produce eight one-hour shows for the upcoming year. General Motors agreed to sponsor six of the eight, but later backed out of the deal when it found out that one of the broadcasts would focus on the vice-presidency. Anticipating an attack on Nixon, General Motors feared possible controversy. Another sponsor was not found for the season, and the network had to foot the entire "See It Now" bill.[122]

Halberstam argued that CBS planned to ease "See It Now," because of its controversial nature, off the network schedule. After the smoke had cleared from the McCarthy broadcasts,

> . . . quite systematically, CBS moved to emasculate Ed Murrow. First to limit the number of 'See It Now' shows. Then to control the hour they were shown. Then to change the name. [Murrow produced a program called 'Small World' in the late fifties]. Then to take the show away completely.[123]

Halberstam admitted that this was probably not done "even that consciously,"[124] but he clearly emphasized the battle between Murrow and "the corporation." Murrow *did* struggle with CBS during the mid-fifties, pushing the network beyond reasonable bounds. Because of his stature CBS allowed him to remain "above" immediate business concerns, but when his position was threatened he became bitter. He had created a role for himself that was no longer necessary or appropriate. Murrow's autonomy (which could result in unwanted controversy) and his demand for programming excellence clashed with a business that, once established, strived for higher and higher profits. "See It Now" was a loss leader for the network, and the prestige garnered for carrying the documentary series in prime time was no longer deemed necessary. The series would be shown irregularly from this point on, as a sixty or ninety-minute "special."[125]

"Person to Person" is the monkey wrench of Ed Murrow's career, causing problems for television historians and journalists alike. Both choose essentially to ignore the program or to deny its significance in making him a truly popular figure. In 1978, New York City's public television station rebroadcast a series of "Person to Person" interviews. The program, wrote *New York Times* critic John J. O'Connor,

> . . . can still make television journalists nervous . . . They are reminded that the master himself was not above milking the celebrity cow. Mr. Murrow could throw politicians soft questions or could chuckle with starlets along with the worst of the talk show hosts.[126]

Both of Murrow's programs influenced television journalism. He set standards still in effect at the networks today and was the role model for

the television foreign correspondent. "See It Now" was the first "magazine" documentary program, and it attempted to appeal to a broad spectrum of the population. "The talk was simple, honest, courageous . . . understandable to the common folk as well as the intellectuals," observed Crosby.[127] The perennially popular "Sixty Minutes" is a direct legacy of this approach to news, and in fact many "Sixty Minutes" staff members worked with Murrow on "See It Now."[128]

"Person to Person" boosted Murrow's status from that of well-known newscaster to popular culture icon; it is also a record of the cult of celebrity as it existed during the fifties. Murrow's lead role legitimized the personality profile as a part of video journalism. Innovative from a technical viewpoint, it was also one of the first celebrity interview programs. We can see the influence of the program as the network anchormen casually interrupt their reading of the days' news to conduct live interviews via satellite hookup. The celebrity interview is also a staple of the television newsmagazines.

Murrow's ambivalence concerning "Person to Person" is well-noted. Although he recognized its importance as a shield from extensive damage in the McCarthy confrontation, wrote Gates, "at other times [he] clearly regarded 'Person to Person' as an embarrassment. 'I hate that goddamn show,' he once said in a flash of temper, 'it's so damn demeaning.' Then, a moment later, he added, 'But it really makes a lot of money.' "[129] Halberstam argued that Murrow decided to host the program to mask his increasingly dark and controversial celluloid exposures on "See It Now" in a candy-coating of personal celebrity. This would be achieved by his association with the wide range of uncontroversial stars featured on "Person to person."[130]

Janet Murrow offered the best explanation of his motives in a personal correspondence with the author. Mrs. Murrow wrote:

> The reason for his [Ed Murrow's] having done it ['Person to Person'] was because Jesse Zousmer and Johnny Aaron wanted to get into TV. They had been helping Ed with his radio program for several years. Ed was always kind to friends and wanted to help them. They had lunch together one day and addressed the question: What are people most interested in? The answer was 'How other people live.' Of course Ed thought immediately that they'd show how everyone lived, the poor as well as the rich and famous — all kinds of people. It turned out to be mostly people who were well known.
>
> So what began as an attempt to assist Johnny and Jesse ended by making Ed better known to many people. We hoped that it added to the audiences of 'See It Now' even though the subject matter of the programs was so different.[131]

There are several reasons why the show was not as informative as Murrow would have liked. His influence on the shape of "Person to Person" scarcely compared to his influence on "See It Now." Aaron and Zousmer handled the bulk of production details, with most of Murrow's time devoted to "See It Now" and his radio broadcasts. The broadcaster was far from aggressive in demanding more substantive interview subjects. He occassionally proposed interviews with ordinary Americans, but these never came about. At the end of the 1955-56 season he sug-

gested appearances by Margaret Mead, John Hersey, John Steinbeck, David Cohn, Sam Rayburn, Tom Dewey, and others from academia, politics, and the arts. But, wrote Kendrick, while "Murrow proposed . . . Zousmer and Aaron disposed. None of the people he wanted appeared that year, or ever, on 'Person to Person.' "[132]

The format remained the same during his six years as host, and the limitations of the program's structure were obvious. Technical problems, scripted questions, rehearsed movements and a time limitation of 11 minutes and 15 seconds per interview precluded almost any possibility of an informative, in-depth *tete-a-tete*. As the show grew in popularity it became more and more difficult to change the format, and there seemed little reason to. Murrow's position at the network had rapidly diminished after the cancellaton of "See It Now" as a weekly series. By 1956, like it or not, "Person to Person" remained as his last trump card. Any alterations in the program could have meant the end of his television career.

Murrow became, not unwittingly, a victim of the economics of television. Although he sometimes pretended to be ignorant of the importance of profits in the industry, he could be a shrewd businessman. Under a unique arrangement he co-owned the program with Aaron and Zousmer. By 1955, proceeds from "Person to Person" accounted for a substantial chunk of his income;[133] this depended on large audiences. With "Person to Person" growing increasingly popular, he attempted to capitalize on the success. Despite an already jammed schedule, he seriously considered a Saturday spinoff, to be called "Youngsters," featuring juveniles between ages six to sixteen in remote interviews. "Unlike his 'Person' show, Murrow will concentrate on just plain little joes with an occasional offspring of a headliner or VIP thrown in for marquee values," *Variety* reported.[134] Earlier, a radio version of "Person to Person," to be broadcast the weekend after the live telecast, had been suggested. Though never realized, the planning of these programs indicates that Murrow constantly attempted to extend his reach.[135]

Murrow's two "personas," journalist and celebrity interviewer, demanded the same flair for drama, but in other ways they diverged widely. Each fit neatly within one of two cultures that conflicted in the twentieth century. "The older culture — Puritan-republican, producer-capitalist — demanded something it called 'character,' which stressed moral qualities, whereas the newer culture insisted on 'personality,' which emphasized being liked and admired," wrote cultural historian Warren I. Susman. The two cultures create "special problems for the investigator." To those who held to the values of the older culture — "hard work, denial, and even sacrifice for the cause" — the newer culture seemed at best frivolous but most likely dangerous.[136]

Dwight Macdonald, for example, lamented the rise of the new mass media as cultural conduits in the 1950s and 1960s. Highly disappointed by what passed as "art" and "entertainment" on radio and television, he faulted these mechanisms for producing a watered-down product aimed squarely at a mass audience. "Today in the United States the demands of the audience, which has changed from a small body of connoisseurs [pre-nineteenth century] into a large body of ignoramuses have become the chief criteria of success."[137]

In opposition to traditional, or "high culture," masscult is "non-art."

The standards of the audience are all that matters. Wrote Macdonald, "The masses put an absurdly high value on the personal genius, the charisma, of the performer, but they also demand a secret rebate: he must play the game — *their* game — must distort his personality to suit their taste."[138]

Many of the critics, biographers and historians who have chronicled Murrow's television career do not like to believe that Murrow "played the game." He was somehow part of television yet apart from television. His limitations — telvision's limitations — are often considered mistakes and written off as unimportant. Media critic Ron Powers, for example, decries television news' emphasis on celebrities and human interest stories. Yet he is unwilling to confront Murrow's involvement with "Person to Person." Calling him "the founding father of television journalism," he said that, "To trivialize Edward R. Murrow . . . as nothing more than a celebrity interviewer, a sort of intellectual antecedent to Rona Barrett, is to badly misunderstand the history of the genre."[139]

Lardner felt that Murrow's "Person to Peson" role threatened the critical faculties that sustained his "See It Now" work. This belated criticism came in 1958:

> One night some weeks ago . . . I began to get the feeling that the scope of Mr. Murrow's work is not only astonishing but maybe a little too wide . . . What worries me is that the added weight of his lighter moments, which somehow seem several pounds heavier than this thoughtful moments, may in the long run cause him to dislocate some vital part of himself — the muscle of judgment, perhaps, or the ganglion of interpretation.[140]

With "See It Now" being eased off the CBS schedule, "Person to Person" had become Murrow's most identifiable television role. Lardner expressed a concern that it would become his only video persona, and recognized that even the great Murrow could be reduced to a shadow of his former self by the demands of the network and the "Person to Person" audience.

One characteristic of masscult, wrote Macdonald, is that it "is very, very, democratic; it refuses to discriminate against or between anything or anybody."[141] This fairly accurately describes both "Person to Person" and "See It Now." Those chosen to appear on the former were all treated the same way, interviewed in the same fashion, paid the same fee for appearing (nothing), and alloted the same length of interview time. Bill McCutcheon, an unknown actor, could appear on the same half-hour broadcast as Arthur Godfrey. The message was clear: at bottom we are all equals, interesting in our own way, and hence worthy of attention.

Murrow, Zousmer and Aaron intended the "at home" setting to serve as an equalizer. Backstage, away from the glaring lights, they figured, the "real person" would emerge. The clumsiness of a rehearsed interview precluded this kind of intimacy, however. The producers avoided topics that could possibly offend either interviewee or audience. Guests were purposely held in check. Bogart, Horn remembered,

> . . . said he wouldn't mind talking about anything during the on-air interview. But among the revelations [made in the days preceding the broadcast, while the crew set up] we didn't use were two: that nails-hard Bogie cried at weddings — 'Always!' said Bet-

> ty – and that he did not love his mother, Maud Humphrey, a painter-illustrator who used him as a model for baby-food advertisements when he was an infant. His remarks about his mother called for deeper psychological probing than we had time for.[142]

Bogart's difficult relationship with his mother could not have been discussed on "Person to Person." It would have made both Murrow and his audience uncomfortable, which had to be scrupulously avoided. Such intense questioning would have also involved an effort on the part of the audience, possibly lowering ratings.[143]

Murrow, like most serious journalists, tried to gain a large audience. This obviously involved compromise, resulting in superficial treatment of many "See It Now" subjects. Murrow wanted to reach the average American, and to a large extent this could be achieved by watering down his material. Few of the hundreds of broadcasts provoked controversy. This is not a criticism of "See It Now" or Murrow; the medium of television imposes limitations on serious broadcasting of any type. To appeal to the largest number of people, you must do what is *least unpalatable* to the most people. The object is not to offend.

Murrow was able to maintain a balance between his role as reporter and commentator and that of host on "Person to Person." Indeed, his great reputation for integrity and depth of character added much to that program even while its superficialty threatened this reputation. While simply a televison "personality" to a large segment of the population, he manged to maintain his credibility as a journalist. He adapted to this situation because he was a performer at all times. Even while off camera Murrow took great care with his actions. His status, like other public figures "forced [him] to live his private life in a public fashion, and his role in one influence[d] his role in the other," wrote Horace Newcomb in *TV: The Most Popular Art*.[144] During the McCarthy confrontation, for example, he carefully considered what he said in private and crafted his communications with the junior Senator from Wisonsin with the foreknowledge that they would be made public. Rumors and gossip did not surround Murrow's life. With so much of his time devoted to his work, he simply had little of a private life to talk about.

Murrow would carry with him, from his high school and college acting career, a flair for the dramatic. "Much of his strength as a personality . . . was the result of his having mastered the art of *playing* himself," wrote Gates.[145] One of his legacies to broadcast journalism was the idea that a reporter must also be a performer. He must draw people to watch or listen by projecting an image of "real life" that is as interesting and exciting as the competing fictional entertainment programs. Newcomb said,

> The excitement of [the newscasters'] lives is expressed not only by the exotic nature of their travels but by the importance of their work as well. They keep us informed, and to do so, they must appear in all the centers of action . . . Things happen around them as they happen around the heroes of spy and detective fiction; or at least, that is the way we perceive it.[146]

During World War II, Murrow was at the center of the action, as much by design as by accident. Standing on London rooftops during German bombing raids, racing around the blacked-out streets in search of a particularly compelling story, he originated the idea, wrote Matusow, of

"news as theater, with the reporter playing the part of the protagonist."[147] Besides being a city under seige, London also served as a communications center, with Murrow controlling the CBS news feed to New York. But after the war, the scope of news broadened, leaving no geographic "center of action." Through television, though, Murrow solved this problem. The studio became the center, with Murrow at the helm. This was portrayed to the viewing audience: from the very beginning viewers saw that it was he who controlled the information coming through on the monitors surrounding him. He may not have been the reporter on the scene, but he still "took us" there.

Murrow focused on people — the news as seen through and by the "ordinary" individual. The story of the "little guy," he recognized, perfectly suited the medium of television. It was much easier to identify with an individual personality than with the "official" version of news. A good television reporter, Murrow told a 1957 audience, is a "humanist." And the reporter-as-humanist "is one who cares, and is preoccupied with what is worth caring about. Another characteristic of the humanist is that he is preoccupied with the mystery of personality."[148] The "Radulovich" and "Annie Lee Moss" broadcasts are examples of how he used individuals to illuminate larger issues, how by focusing on those people actually *involved* the message became clearer and more urgent. His obvious sympathy for these individuals made "See It Now's" real-life dramas all the more compelling.

Before "Person to Person," Murrow was a popular broadcast journalist, but the celebrity-interview program made him a sex symbol. More women watched "Person to Person" than any other telecast, and by 1954 articles about him appeared in *Vogue* and *McCall's*, two enormously popular women's magazines. *Vogue* writer Allene Talmey described what made him attractive to women viewers:

> Murrow, whose business is words, is highly photographic with his three deep forehead wrinkles, his trade-mark mole, the cluster of crow's-feet at the corners of his dark blue eyes, on the screen he often holds his head down, with chin tucked in and eyes forward, before he smiles a sudden sweet gentle smile at millions unseen in living rooms.[149]

Look featured Murrow in a series entitled "Men Who Fascinate Women." In April 1955 it reported,

> America's famous reporter is well on the way to becoming the television idol of the sober, adult world. His mobile face — slick, yet craggy — is in the public domain, and women who wouldn't be caught dead in a bobby-sox crowd loudly admit his allure . . . A serious week-end farmer, he gives wife and son full measure of the deep melodious voice, the modulated twinkle, the crooked smile.[150]

It is paradoxical that his new-found popularity among women came from his performance on a program where he was often noticably uncomfortable. Perhaps this added to his attractiveness, wrote Gates, "but most of the time on 'Person to Person' he seemed to be going against the grain of his true identity and vocation."[151] Lardner noted that "he cannot help being and sounding sincere," and that this sincerity often seemed "grossly inappropriate" on "Person to Person."[152]

Others saw it differently. *Time* wrote of Murrow's "urbane charm and ready smile," noting that it blended well with his projection of "virile

authority."[153] His voice also topped the list of attributes; even those who tagged it "the voice of doom" recognized that the sense of urgency conveyed by Murrow's low-keyed inflections drew in the listener. His "popular cadence,"[154] commented one critic, blended with "a splendidly controlled vocal range that can project any kind of emotion without distorting the pitch . . ."[155]

These superficial but vital elements of Murrow's popularity supplemented an already established reputation for integrity. He had gained respect from the political and diplomatic leaders and the intellectual elite because his concern for "the truth" dominated all other aspects of his professional life. The duel with McCarthy, despite the shortcomings discussed earlier, indicated his strength of character; he had put himself on the line for a cause that in the long run could only turn out right. He had much to gain and much to lose in that confrontation, and he actually did both. His reputation as a journalist could not be questioned — he had mastered both major electronic media. But his standing with CBS faltered as corporations balked at sponsoring a program that featured low ratings and a continuing potential to provoke controversy. "See It Now" would have died a slower death were it not for the McCarthy battle, but in all likelihood by the mid-fifties the program would have been doomed anyway.

It is not surprising that "Person to Person" attracted more viewers than "See It Now." The former, despite many faults, consistently brought the "big names" into the viewers' homes. Their often disappointing performances seemed to have little effect on the audience, who tuned in week after week — perhaps unsatisfied, but anticipating a potentially enlightening and entertaining half-hour. "See It Now" did not have the immediate appeal to keep large numbers of people awake during the late hours of a school and work night. Although Murrow conveyed a sense of urgency and importance to many of the stories on "See It Now," the masses, still numbed by World War II, seemed tired of urgency. An obviously important issue — McCarthyism, for example — could still grab their interest, but it did not inspire great numbers of viewers to tune in. This may say more about the decade of the fifties than it does about "See It Now."

Murrow's star reached a peak in 1955, but plunged in the following years. He "suffered from his personal style, which by the late 1950s became quite out of fashion," wrote Baughman.[156] World War II and the threat of fascism had ingrained in Murrow a "sense of urgency," which did not suit the approaching age of Camelot. Viewers became attached to the dry, sarcastic humor of David Brinkley and folksiness of Walter Cronkite. These men, first of the new breed of "anchormen," soon transformed Murrow the man into Murrow the legend.[157]

Murrow's Legacy

Television news today is widely covered in the print press. Articles abound concerning the evening news broadcasts of the major networks, and their ferocious ratings race. Ted Turner's Cable News Network and the Macneil/Lehrer Report on PBS also create headlines. Recently large cuts and layoffs at CBS News, followed by the cancellation of the "CBS Morning News," have been cause for great concern, with many conten-

ding that the quality of the news will plummet. "60 Minutes' " Andy Rooney wrote that "CBS News will never again be as good as it once was," saying that "the people running the network news operations . . . are company men first and newsmen second . . . Unlike some of their predecessors, they are not willing to die professionally for a journalistic principle."[158]

The conflicts that Murrow experienced with his television career continue on with today's anchormen. Alex S. Jones, in *The New York Times Magazine*, wrote "The networks demand that an anchor be the network's premier journalist and principal showman, top editor and star, symbol of news excellence and the network's single most important living logo. Despite his overwhelming ratings, Bill Cosby is not NBC. Tom Brokaw is NBC."[159]

If we extend this analogy and say that Dan Rather is CBS, we must also say that Edward R. Murrow is CBS's past. A picture of Murrow is affixed to the door of Rather's office; he considers himself the steward of a CBS news tradition.[160] Television critic Tom Shales wrote that "At CBS, Edward R. Murrow holds the status of patron saint."[161] *Newsweek* speculated that "if TV news were to build its own Mount Rushmore, the first face carved would be that of Edward R. Murrow."[162]

Few would disagree with the notion that Murrow's legacy is one that should be remembered and preserved. Yet these same critics constantly complain about "soft" news and the emphasis on personality features in the evening news broadcasts and the newsmagazine programs. Even those in the business criticize each other for this. ABC News recently began featuring a "person of the week" segment on the Friday evening broadcast, profiling a range of people from Tip O'Neil to pianist Vladimir Horowitz. CBS Chairman and CEO Thomas H. Wyman said, "You're talking *People* magazine more than you're talking news." Roone Arledge, president of ABC News, contends the other networks do the same thing.[163] Indeed, CBS's "West 57th" seems little more than a yuppie gossip sheet disguised as a serious video newsmagazine.

This kind of television journalism is also part of Murrow's legacy. The personality parade began with "Person to Person." But nobody would like to admit it. Journalists, critics, and media historians would like to remember Murrow as being something he was not: an individualist who never compromised his high journalistic standards in the face of corporate pressure. He did compromise, and the result — "Person to Person" — had many tangible benefits for him and for CBS.

The consequences of this mass historical blindness is the continuation of an undimensional analysis that has gone on for 35 years. Television journalism is constantly lambasted for not being serious enough, for being too personality-and-ratings-oriented. The network vice-presidents are the cannon fodder, being blamed for being more concerned with money and ratings than journalistic standards. While this may be true, it is equally true that their priorities will not likely be reversed. A simple lesson in capitalism and economics and oligopolistic behavior is all that one needs to be convinced of this. Another lesson that must be remembered is the one that Macdonald gives in "Masscult and Midcult." Television journalism is a midcult product *at its best*, masscult most of the time. Murrow gave us midcult, at *his* best, masscult most of the time. Murrow did indeed teach us lessons, as much about what televison *can't*

do as what it can be.

NOTES

1. John Crosby, "It Was New And We Were Very Innocent," December 1973 *TV Guide* article reprinted in *TV Guide: The First 25 Years* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978), p. 211.

2. "Edward R. Murrow of CBS: 'Diplomat, Poet, Preacher,' " *Newsweek*, March 9, 1953, p. 44.

3. Quoted in Barbara Matusow, *The Evening Stars: The Making of the Network News Anchor* (Boston: Houghton Miflin, 1983), p. 30.

4. Daniel J. Leab, " 'See It Now': A Legend Reassessed," in John E. O'Conner, ed., *American History/American Television* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1983), p. 5.

5. Gary Paul Gates, *Air Time: The Inside Story of CBS News* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978; Berkeley Books, 1979), p. 32.

6. "This is Murrow," *Time*, September 30, 1957, p. 48.

7. Gary Deeb, *Wisconsin State Journal*, December 8, 1985, "TV Week," p. 31.

8. Dwight Macdonald, "Masscult & Midcult," in *Against the American Grain: Essays on the Effects of Mass Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), p. 3.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

11. This is a quotation by the producers of "Omnibus," taken from Macdonald's "Masscult & Midcult," pp. 39-40. "Omnibus" began on CBS in 1952, and featured a diversity of cultural offerings. "Opera, symphony, ballet, dramatic plays, and true-life adventure films prepared by the New York Zoological Society and the American Museum of Natural History were but a few of the offerings of this award-winning show." It was cancelled by CBS in 1956, but then picked up by ABC for a one-year run. From Tim Brooks and Earle Marsh, *The Complete Directory to Prime Time Network TV shows 1946-Present* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1981), pp. 558-559.

12. Macdonald, "Masscult & Midcult," p. 71.

13. Alexander Kendrick, *Prime Time: The Life of Edward R. Murrow*, (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1969), p. 362.

14. Ann Sperber, *Murrow: His Life and Times* (New York: Freundlich Books, 1986).

15. Henry Fairlie, "King of the Radio," *New Republic*, August 4, 1986, p. 34.

16. Kendrick in *Prime Time* and Fred W. Friendly, in *Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control* (New York: Random House, 1967) discuss the McCarthy broadcasts in detail, but must be used with caution as they invariably paint Murrow's portrait with a halo; Leab's recent review of the series is concise, accurate, and generally excellent; Gilbert Seldes, in *The Public Arts* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956), pp. 212-228, provides an excellent discussion of Murrow, the McCarthy broadcasts, and the issues of fairness and the "equal time formula" as they related to this dispute.

17. Fred W. Friendly, co-producer of "See It Now," had been working as Murrow's partner for several years. He started working for Murrow on his radio newscasts in 1947. Within several years the two became equal partners, their working relationship continuing until Murrow left CBS in 1961. The pair first succeeded with an LP record entitled *I Can Hear It Now*. A compilation of famous and important radio broadcasts from the years 1933-45, it was the first "aural" history ever produced. Released in late 1949, the album enjoyed spectacular success, selling 250,000 copies within a year of its release. This not only shattered the record industry's wisdom that non-musical records would not sell, but it also led to two more volumes of the album, one covering 1945-49, and the other 1919-32.

After the album's success, Murrow and Friendly proposed a new radio program to the network executives, which they described as "A document for the ear." Entitled "Hear It Now," the program reviewed important events of the past week with the use of recordings. Broadcast on 173 CBS stations, it ran for less than a year before giving way to "See It Now" on television. During that brief period the program won a Peabody Award. Kendrick, *Prime Time*, pp. 316-317, 329-330; Leab, " 'See It Now': A Legend Reassessed," p. 6.

18. CBS Press Release, October 29, 1951, (Edward R. Murrow Papers, Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University; Sanford, North Carolina: Microfilming Corporation of America), reel 40. (Referred to

hereafter as "Murrow Papers").

19. Script of the November 18, 1951 "See It Now" broadcast, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Murray Russell Yaeger, "An Analysis of Edward R. Murrow's 'See It Now' Program," (Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1956), p. 51.

22. Transcripts of these broadcasts can be found in Edward R. Murrow and Fred W. Friendly, eds., *See It Now* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), pp. 1-29, and 80-91; interestingly, "Christmas in Korea" was seen in 4,277,000 homes, as compared to "A Report on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy," seen in only 2,394,000 homes, notes Yaeger in "An Analysis of Edward R. Murrow's 'See It Now' program," pp. 269-272.

23. Matusow, *The Evening Stars*, pp. 47, 76.

24. Alcoa's arrangement with "See It Now" differed from most television sponsorships of the early fifties. The company shelled out nearly two million dollars a year for the program, about one-third of its public relations and advertising budget at the time, yet demanded no control over content. Seeking to heighten its public image after a series of anti-trust suits by the government (which would continue until 1956), Alcoa sought to appeal to the opinion leaders of the country, the expected audience for a "highbrow" documentary program. Sponsors directly controlled most programs during this period, but for Alcoa it seemed clearly beneficial to allow Murrow, whose political admirers spanned the ideological spectrum from left to right, to have free reign. Alcoa could then easily clear itself from direct responsibility over any broadcast that proved controversial, while still claiming credit for sponsoring the program as a public service. "Wooing the Eggheads for Alcoa," *Business Week*, December 19, 1953, p. 116. "See It Now" was an expensive program for CBS, as production costs ran 3-4 times Alcoa's outlay, with the web picking up the difference. The program costs (production) ran $24,000, while the "time cost" for the half-hour on the network cost $34,647, for a yearly (44-week season) total of about $2,500,000. These figures are from a CBS brochure put out to advertisers in June 1955, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

25. James L. Baughman, " 'See It Now' and Television's Golden Age, 1951-58," *Journal of Popular Culture* 15 (Fall 1981): 106.

26. Michael Murray, 'SEE IT NOW vs. McCarthyism," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1974) p. 104.

27. Charles Wertenbaker, "The World On His Back," *New Yorker*, Dec. 26, 1953, p. 40.

28. The number of homes reached on the average week were 1,387,000 in 1951-52, and 2,459,000 in 1952-53, CBS brochure, June 1955, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

29. ABC sent out a quiz program called "Name's The Same," which featured a distinguished panel trying to guess the names of contestants who had the same name as a famous person or an object. Hence, Murrow and Friendly had to compete with such individuals as Abraham Lincoln, Mona Lisa, and Napoleon Bonaparte, whose purpose was to keep the panel from guessing their names. NBC broadcast a fifteen minute news program called "On the Line with Considine." Brooks and Marsh, *The Complete Directory To Prime Time Network TV Shows, 1946-Present*, pp. 858-859, 534 and 23.

30. Among the awards "See It Now" won over the years were the Overseas Press Club Award, the George Foster Peabody Award, the Emmy Award, the TV Guide Gold Medal Award, and the Freedom Award. Yaeger, "An Analysis of Edward R. Murrow's 'See It Now' Program," pp. 258-261.

31. James L. Baughman, " 'The Strange Birth of "CBS Reports" Revisited," *The Historical Journal of Film, Radio and TV* 2 (1982): 32.

32. Transcripts of these broadcasts can be found in the Murrow Papers, reel 40; also, transcripts of 'Radulovich,' 'Indianapolis,' and 'Annie Lee Moss,' broadcasts can be found in Murrow and Friendly, *See It Now*.

33. Jack Gould, "Video Journalism: Treatment of Radulovich Case History by 'See It Now' is Fine Reporting," *New York Times*, October 25, 1953, Section II, p. 13.

34. Gates, *Prime Time*, p. 21.

35. A summary and printed statement of the Committee's purposes and a list of members can be found in the Murrow Papers, reel 42; *Collier's*, October 27, 1951, p. 6.

36. Edward R. Murrow, "A-bomb mission to Moscow," *Collier's*, October 27, 1951, p. 19, placed the broadcaster aboard one of the bombers sent to retaliate against Russia for that country's nuclear strikes on U.S. targets. Murrow later stated his feelings about this article in reply to a letter from D.F. Fleming, who wrote about the *Collier's* special in the *Nation*. Murrow felt it was the "result of a sort of collective irresponsibility." Although this is not a quote from the original letter, it is a summary of his response which can be found in the Murrow papers, reel 42.

37. Joe Wershba, "Murrow vs. McCarthy: See It Now," *New York Times Magazine*, March 4, 1979, p. 34.

38. "Edward R. Murrow of CBS: 'Diplomat, Poet, Preacher,'" *Newsweek*, March 9, 1953, p. 44.

39. Murray, "SEE IT NOW vs. McCarthyism," p. 119.

40. Edwin R. Bayley, *Joe McCarthy and the Press* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1981), p. 194.

41. Transcript of "See It Now," December 16, 1951, Murrow Papers, reel 42.

42. "This is News" broadcast, February 5, 1953; Reprinted in Edward Bliss, Jr., ed. *In Search of Light: The Broadcasts of Edward R. Murrow 1938-1961* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), p. 233.

43. On the first "See It Now" broadcast sponsored by Alcoa, Murrow read from his contract with CBS:

> News periods . . . should be devoted to giving the facts emanating from an established news gathering source, to giving all the color in the proper sense of the word and interest without intruding the views of the analyst. The news analyst further can and very often should give as much light as possible on the meaning of events. In other words: the news analyst should not say that they're good or bad in his opinion but should analyze their significance in the light of known facts, the results of similar occurrences and so on. And in this he, of course, should always be fair. He is fully entitled to give and should give the opinions of various persons, groups or political parties when these are known, leaving the listener to draw his own conclusions. . .

Yaeger, "An Analysis of Edward R. Murrow's 'See It Now' Program," p. 57; An account of Murrow's dispute with CBS over editorial policy can be found in Kendrick, *Prime Time*, p. 336.

44. Gould, "Treatment of Radulovich," Section II, p. 13.

45. Yaeger, "An Analysis of Edward R. Murrow's 'See It Now' Program," p. 269, was the only source found that gave an exact rating of the broadcast. Unfortunately, Yaeger cites two different figures, the one given in the text of this article, which came from the appendix of his dissertation; and he also says in the text of his dissertation that Nielson reported a viewership of 3,309,000 homes. What is clear, however, is that the oft-inflated audience figures cited for this broadcast are not grounded in fact; Interestingly, the "coverage," or percent of television homes able to receive the broadcast, was only 61.5, a very low figure.

46. "The Scorched Air: Murrow vs. Senator McCarthy," *Newsweek* March 22, 1954, p. 88; The script for this broadcast, the "Annie Lee Moss" broadcast, and McCarthy's reply can be found in the Murrow Papers, reel 40.

47. Murrow usually read from a teleprompter, but on this night he apologized to his audience for reading from a script. "We want to say exactly what we mean to say," he explained. *Ibid.*

48. Hollenbeck's statement is quoted in Friendly, *Due To Circumstances Beyond Our Control*, p. 41.

49. Response figures are from Val Adams, "Praise Pours In On Murrow Show," *New York Times*, March 11, 1954, p. 11, and Yaeger, "An Analysis of Edward R. Murrow's 'See It Now' Program," pp. 173-174. Response to the program differed substantially from general public opinion on McCarthy. Although his popularity had dipped slightly since December 1953, in a poll taken at the end of February, 46 percent had a favorable opinion of McCarthy, while 36 percent had an unfavorable one. Yet a majority of those with a college education had an unfavorable opinion of McCarthy. Among the college-educated, 42 percent had a favorable opinion of McCarthy, 50 percent unfavorable, George Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion, 1935-1971* (3 vols., New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 1220-1221. These figures do not contradict the audience response to the broadcast: 53 percent of "See It Now" viewers had some college education, as compared to 28 percent of those in all television homes. "See It Now With Edward R. Murrow," Brochure to sell "See It Now" to advertisers, CBS, June 1955, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

50. Jack Gould, "Television in Review: Murrow vs. McCarthy," *New York Times*, March 11, 1954, p. 38. Later some would criticize Murrow for his methods, notably John Cogley of *Commonweal* and Murrow's friend Gilbert Seldes of the *Saturday Review*. Both Cogley and Seldes, though sympathetic to Murrow's viewpoint, felt that his use of television in this matter had been unfair because McCarthy lacked the resources to reply effectively on television. Television's long-disputed "equal time" formula was at fault. McCarthy had been given thirty minutes by CBS to reply, but did not have the resources of a television

network to defend himself adequately. Friendly, *Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control*, p. 46; John Cogley, "The Murrow Show," *Commonweal*, March 26, 1954, p. 618; Gilbert Seldes, "Murrow, McCarthy and the Empty Formula," *Saturday Review*, April 24, 1954, pp. 26-27.

51. From transcript of McCarthy reply, Murrow Papers, reel 41.

52. Joseph Doyle, "Murrow: The Man, the Myth, and the McCarthy Fighter," *Look*, August 24, 1954, p. 27.

53. "Person to Person" had a much larger audience than "See It Now." *Time* reported in 1957 that he program was seen in 8,300,000 homes, compared to only 3,850,000 for "See It Now." "This is Murrow," *Time*, September 30, 1957, p. 48.

54. CBS backed Murrow throughout the dispute, but was very concerned about the controversy and the network's reputation. Network President Frank Stanton commissioned a Roper Poll after the McCarthy reply to assess opinion of the affair. The findings disturbed him. 59 percent of those questioned had seen the program or heard of it, and of those, 33 percent, wrote Barnouw, "believed that McCarthy had raised doubts about Murrow, or proved him pro-communist." This might have been more of a comment on the composition of the audience for McCarthy's reply than anything else. Seen in 5,757,000 homes, it was perhaps the most highly-rated of any Tuesday night "See It Now" broadcast. It is likely that many people who would have never turned in to Murrow watched this program, and that the reason for watching it was the appearance of McCarthy. That many of these one-time viewers were McCarthy suppoters seems likely. Yet, the network grew increasingly wary of Murrow's increasing power and popularity, and his support from the left. Erik Barnouw, *The Image Empire*, Volume III of *A History of Broadcasting in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 53.

55. William Pfaff, "News on the Networks," *Commonweal*, April 9, 1954, p. 14, wrote that Murrow had become leader of a cause, however:

> Now, the corrosive crisis of suspicion and intolerance has forced Murrow himself to become (perhaps a bit to his own surprise) a crusader, a leader of those who feel that Senator McCarthy represents a threat to traditional American values. Prominent in this group are the liberals, and Murrow has already begun to receive the swarming embraces which in the past have been visited upon Adlai Stevenson and Elmer Davis.

56. Said Murrow, "I didn't say anything I haven't said many times before on the radio and on the Radulovich show . . . I imagine it was McCarthy's picture that made the impact." "Murrow Calls It 'Reporting,' " *Newsweek*, March 29, 1954, p. 51.

57. Pfaff, "News on the Networks," p. 13.

58. Wertenbaker, "The World on his Back," p. 28.

59. Norman Swallow, *Factual Television* (London and New York: Focal Press, 1971), p. 73.

60. David Halberstam, *The Powers That Be* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979; Dell, 1980), p. 199.

61. "Murrow's 'Person' CBS-TV 'Sleeper,' Parker Wants in," *Variety*, February 24, 1954, p. 25.

62. Halberstam, *The Powers That Be*, p. 199.

63. Barnouw, *The Image Empire*, p. 51.

64. Kendrick, *Prime Time*, p. 360.

65. "Murrow's 'Person' CBS-TV 'Sleeper,' " p. 25.

66. Quoted in Joe McCarthy, "The Inside Story of Person to Person," *Look*, December 13, 1955, p. 91.

67. Val Adams, "Ed Murrow: An Electronic Visitor," *New York Times*, December 20, 1953, Sec. II, p. 13.

68. James L. Baughman "Television in the 'Golden Age': An Entrepreneurial Experiment," *The Historian* (February 1985): 175-195.

69. Letter, Jesse Zousmer to Murrow, December 9, 1954, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

70. Memo, Paley to Murrow, October 8, 1953, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

71. Memo, Murrow to Mickelson, November 4, 1954, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

72. Memo, Steward to Murrow, Zousmer, and Aaron, April 29, 1954, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

73. Memo, Murrow to Robinson, October 23, 1953, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

74. Script of "Person to Person," broadcast of October 2, 1953, Murrow Papers, reel 37.

75. "Murrow's Yen For Pix Stars," *Variety*, November 24, 1954, p. 22.

76. "TV Followup," *Variety*, May 25, 1955, p. 77.

77. From a list of "Person to Person" guests, 1953-57, Murrow Papers, reel 40.

78. Script, "Person to Person" broadcast of October 2, 1953, Murrow Papers, reel 37.
79. Jack Gould, "Television In Review: Celebrity Time," *New York Times*, October 7, 1953, p. 41.
80. "TV Followup," *Variety*, March 31, 1954, p. 30.
81. McCarthy, "The Inside Story of Person to Person," p. 91.
82. "TV Followup," *Variety*, December 8, 1954, p. 30.
83. "TV Followup," *Variety*, April 16, 1955, p. 20.
84. These and a few other "Person to Person" kinescopes are available at the Museum of Broadcasting in New York City.
85. Script, "Person to Person" broadcast of October 30, 1953, Murrow Papers, reel 37.
86. *Ibid.*
87. Videotape, October 30, 1953 broadcast of "Person to Person."
88. "Strauss Takes A 'P to P' Raincheck," *Variety*, January 12, 1955, p. 31.
89. "Murrow And Sarnoff Pal It Up," *Variety*, November 16, 1955, p. 25.
90. "NBC In Murrow's Tomorrow?," *Variety*, November 10, 1954, p. 25, listed stars from the competing networks that appeared or were scheduled to appear on "Person to Person." NBC – David Sarnoff, Dean Martin & Jerry Lewis, Groucho Marx, Eddie Fisher, Imogene Coca, Wally Cox, Sid Caesar, Martha Raye, Bob Smith, Ezio Pinza, Guy Lombardo. Scheduled – Red Buttons, Dinah Shore, Vaughn Monroe, Maurice Evans. CBS – Arthur Godfrey, Ed Sullivan, Bill & Cora Baird. Scheduled – Robert Q. Lewis, Lowell Thomas, Garry Moore; "Murrow Drops Out of NBC-TV Spec.," *Variety*, November 24, 1954, p. 23.
91. Videotape, March 12, 1954 broadcast of "Person to Person."
92. Script, March 12, 1954 "Person to Person" broadcast, Murrow Papers, reel 37.
93. Videotapes, March 12, 1954 and September 3, 1954 broadcasts of "Person to Person."
94. Videotape and script, March 12, 1954 "Person to Person" broadcast.
95. "Television Followup Comment," *Variety*, March 17, 1954, p. 26.
96. Script, September 3, 1954 broadcast of "Person to Person," Murrow Papers, reel 38.
97. *Ibid*; "Television Reviews," *Variety*, September 8, 1954, p. 36.
98. The national rating for "Person to Person" for the broadcast of April 16, 1954, with guests Archbishop Richard J. Cushing and Lilly Dache, was 21.1, versus 11.5 for "Gillette" and 4.5 for "Down You Go." "Hub's Whooping 41.6 for 'Person' Steps Up Drive to End Blackout," *Variety*, April 21, 1954, p. 24.
99. "Onward And Upward With 'P to P,' " *Variety*, December 22, 1954, p. 27.
100. " 'Person to Person' Up To 87 Outlets," *Variety*, January 19, 1955, p. 25.
101. " 'P to P' From A (Aaron) to Z (Zousmer)," *Variety*, June 29, 1955, p. 27.
102. "NBC In Murrow's Tomorrow?," *Variety*, November 10, 1954, pp. 24, 44.
103. Halberstam, p. 209.
104. "Onward And Upward With 'P to P,' " *Variety*, December 22, 1954, p. 27. The broadcast had scored a 29.9 rating, 11.3 points higher than in November. Audience share increased by 18.5%, with the "Gillette Calvacade of Sports" losing 9.3%, of its share.
105. " 'P to P' From A to Z," *Variety*, June 29, 1955, p. 27.
106. "Tele Followup Comment," *Variety*, November 25, 1953, p. 42.
107. "Inside Stuff – Radio-TV," *Variety*, September 8, 1954, p. 34.
108. McCarthy, "An Inside Look at Person to Person," p. 85.
109. "Truman Sees End to 'Cold War'; Interviewed by Daughter on TV," *New York Times*, May 28, 1955, pp. 1, 33. The entire 30 minutes was devoted to this interview, which, "T to T on 'P to P,' " *Variety*, on June 1, 1955, p. 29, said, "only a benighted Republican would deny the high quality of."
110. "Truman Sees End to 'Cold War,' " *New York Times*, May 28, 1955, p. 33.
111. Kendrick, *Prime Time*, p. 364.
112. "Murrow's Champ Status as Femme Draw, Tops 'Life,' " *Variety*, November 10, 1954, p. 25. "Person to Person" edged out "This Is Your Life," according to American Research Bureau statistics. *Variety* reported a score for "Person to Person" 56% compared to "This Is Your Life's 52%. It is unclear, however, exactly what these figures mean.
113. "This is Murrow," *Time*, September 30, 1957, pp. 48-49.
114. *Ibid.*
115. John Lardner, "The Air: The Perils of Frivolity," *New Yorker*, January 11, 1958, p. 104.
116. Gilbert Seldes, "At Home with Edward Murrow," *Saturday Review*, November 7, 1953, pp. 37-38.

117. *Ibid.*
118. Letter, Sobbs to Zousmer and Aaron, February 26, 1958, Murrow Papers, reel 40.
119. Robert J. Landry, "Edward R. Murrow," *Scribner's*, December 1938, p. 10.
120. Edward R. Murrow, Speech delivered to Association of Radio and Television News Directors' Convention, Chicago, October 15, 1958. From Draft of Speech, Murrow Papers, reel 50.
121. Kendrick, *Prime Time*, p. 337.
122. Halberstam, *The Powers That Be*, p. 211.
123. *Ibid.*, p. 209.
124. *Ibid.*
125. Once dropped from the regular schedule, "See It Now" began to draw its largest audiences, but the average 3,860,000 homes reached per program in 1956-57 was far from spectacular by comparison. "Person to Person" in 1956-57 was viewed weekly in 8,300,000 homes. "This is Murrow," *Time*, September 30, 1957, p. 48.
126. John J. O'Connor, "TV: Murrow's 'Person to Person' Returns," *New York Times*, July 6, 1979, p. C19.
127. Crosby, "It Was New And We Were Very Innocent," p. 212.
128. Among these were Palmer Williams, who retired as senior producer of "Sixty Minutes" in 1982, and Joseph Wershba, a producer on both "See It Now" and "Sixty Minutes."
129. Gates, *Air Time*, p. 33.
130. Halberstam, *The Powers That Be*, p. 209.
131. Janet Murrow, confidential correspondence to the author, April 17, 1987. John Hoen, a field producer for "Person to Person," concurred with this explanation. He wrote: "He had a full work schedule: 'See It Now' on television once a week, his newscasts on radio five nights a week. He had to be persuaded, before he took on added responsibility, by two theories: that 'Person to Person' could be informative as well as entertaining and that its popularity would help swell his audience for 'See It Now,' the program close to his heart. The first theory did not always work as imagined; the second did." From " 'Person to Person' Brings The 1950s Back to Life," *New York Times*, July 2, 1978, Section II, p. 21.
132. Kendrick, *Prime Time*, p. 368.
133. Murrow owned 40 percent of "Persons to Persons, Inc." Zousmer and Aaron split the remaining 60 percent. The program was leased by CBS until 1957, when it was sold to the network for a large sum. *Ibid.*, p. 362.
134. "Murrow's Third Show, Kid Edition," *Variety*, August 18, 1954, p. 23.
135. "Murrow's 'Person' In Radio Edition," *Variety*, November 18, 1953, p. 29.
136. Warren I. Susman, *Culture As History* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), p. xxii-xxviii.
137. Macdonald, "Masscult & Midcult," p. 18.
138. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-26.
139. Ron Powers, *The Newscasters: The News Business As Show Business*, Revised Edition (New York: Norton Publications, Inc., 1980), p. 171.
140. Lardner, "The Air: The Perils of Frivolity," p. 104.
141. Macdonald, "Masscult and Midcult," p. 12.
142. Hoen, " 'Person to Person' Brings The 1950s Back To Life," p. 21.
143. This is an application of the following Macdonald argument, "Masscult and Midcult," pp. 4-5:

> Masscult offers its customers neither an emotional catharis nor an aesthetic experience, for these demand effort. The production line grinds out a uniform product whose humble aim is not even entertainment, for this too implies life and hence effort, but merely distraction . . . And it gives nothing.
>
> A work of High Culture, however inept, is an expression of feelings, ideas, tastes, visions that are idiosyncratic and the audience similarly responds to them as individuals. [In Masscult, there is not] any communication between individuals.

144. Horace Newcomb, *TV: The Most Popular Art*, (Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1974), p. 199.
145. Gates, *Air Time*, p. 16.
146. Newcomb, *TV: The Most Popular Art*, pp. 188-189.
147. Matusow, *The Evening Stars*, pp. 188-189.
148. Speech delivered by Murrow upon receiving the Albert Einstein Award, May 5, 1957, Murrow Papers, reel 50.
149. Allene Talmey, " 'See Them Now': Ed Murrow And the Man Behind Him, Fred Friendly," *Vogue*, February 1, 1954, p. 145. The "crow's-feet" referred to by Talmey,

along with the famous "furrowed brow," were more the result of bright studio lights and lack of sleep than deep, concentrated thought, as the allusion to these physical traits attempted to portray.

150. "Men Who Fascinate Women," *Look*, April 5, 1955, p. 102.
151. Gates, *Air Time*, p. 32.
152. Lardner, "The Air: The Perils of Frivolity," p. 104.
153. "This Is Murrow," *Time*, September 30, 1957, p. 49.
154. Gore Vidal, "See It Later," *New York Review of Books*, December 7, 1967, p. 26.
155. Unidentified "expert," quoted in Kendrick, p. 307.
156. Baughman, " 'See It Now' and Television's Golden Age, 1951-58," p. 111.
157. *Ibid.*
158. Andy Rooney, "The golden age of television news has ended," *Wisconsin State Journal*, August 3, 1986, Sect. 5, p. 4. The reference he makes here to those "willing to die professionally for a journalistic principle" is obviously to Fred Friendly, who quit his post as CBS News President in 1966 because the network insisted on showing "I Love Lucy" reruns rather than televise Senate hearings on Vietnam.
159. Alex S. Jones, "The Anchors: Who They Are, What They Do, The Tests They Face," *The New York Times Magazine*, July 27, 1986, p. 14.
160. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
161. Tom Shales, "Movie called 'Murrow' causing uproar at CBS," *The Milwaukee Journal*, December 11, 1985.
162. Richard Zoglin, "Tackling a TV News Legend," *Newsweek*, January 13, 1986, p. 54.
163. Jones, "The Anchors," pp. 23-24.

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS

No. 1 — Walter B. Emery, "Five European Broadcasting Systems." *August 1966*
No. 2 — Eugene J. Webb and Jerry R. Salancik, "The Interview or the Only Wheel In Town." *November 1966*
No. 3 — James E. Grunig, "The Role of Information in Economic Decision Making." *December 1966*
No. 4 — Linda Weiner Hausman, "Criticism of the Press in U.S. Periodicals: 1900-1939: An Annotated Bibliography." *August 1967*
No. 5 — George Gerbner, "The Press and the Dialogue in Education." *September 1967*
No. 6 — Peter B. Knights, "The Press Association War of 1866-1867." *December 1967*
No. 7 — Elmer Davis, "Report to the President," edited by Ronald T. Farrar. *August 1968*
No. 8 — Steven H. Chaffee and L. Scott Ward, "Channels of Communication in School-Community Relations." *September 1968*
No. 9 — Walter Wilcox, "The Press, the Jury and the Behavioral Sciences." *October 1968*
No. 10 — Don R. Pember, "The South Act as a Restraint on the Press." *May 1969*
No. 11 — Joy Schaleben, "Getting the Story Out of Nazi Germany: Louis P. Lochner." *June 1969*
No. 12 — Carter R. Bryan, "Negro Journalism in America Before Emancipation." *September 1969*
No. 13 — George Gerbner, "The Film Hero: A Cross-Cultural Study." *November 1969*
No. 14 — Steven H. Chaffee, Keith R. Stamm, Jose L. Guerrero and Leonard P. Tipton, "Experiments on Cognitive Discrepancies and Communication." *December 1969*
No. 15 — Darwin Payne, "The Press Corps and the Kennedy Assassination." *February 1970*
No. 16 — Elmer A. Beck, "Autopsy of a Labor Daily: The Milwaukee Leader." *August 1970*
No. 17 — Jim A. Richstad, "The Press Under Martial Law: The Hawaiian Experience." *November 1970*
No. 18 — Mary A. Gardner, "The Press of Guatemala." *February 1971*
No. 19 — Robert L. Bishop and LaMar S. Mackay, "Mysterious Silence, Lyrical Scream: Government Information in World War II." *May 1971*
No. 20 — Phillip Palmgreen, "A Daydream Model of Communication." *August 1971*
No. 21 — William E. Francois, "Evaluating Programmed News Writing Instructions." *November 1971*
No. 22 — David Gordon, "The 1896 Maryland Shield Law: The American Roots of Evidentiary Privilege for Newsmen." *February 1972*
No. 23 — Karlen Mouradian, "The Dawn of Printing." *May 1972*
No. 24 — Maxwell E. McCombs, "Mass Media in the Marketplace." *August 1972*
No. 25 — John W. Garberson, "A Limited Number of Advertising Pages." *November 1972*
No. 26 — Thomas H. Guback and Steven P. Hill, "The Beginnings of Soviet Broadcasting and the Role of V.I. Lenin." *December 1972*
No. 27 — John D. Stevens, "From the Back of the Foxhole: Black Correspondents in World War II." *February 1973*
No. 28 — Don Dodson and William A. Hachten, "Communication and Development: African and Afro-American Parallels." *May 1973*
No. 29 — Guido H. Stempel III, "Effects on Performance of a Cross-Media Monopoly." *June 1973*
No. 30 — Beth Heffner, "Communicatory Accuracy: Four Experiments." *August 1973*
No. 31 — Jerry W. Knudson, "The Press and the Bolivian National Revolution." *November 1973*
No. 32 — Herbert Strentz, Kenneth Starck, David L. Anderson and Loren Ghiglione, "The Critical Factor: Criticism of the News Media in Journalism Education." *February 1974*
No. 33 — Edmund M. Mahra, "A.J. Liebling: The Wayward Pressman as Critic." *April 1974*
No. 34 — James E. Murphy, "The New Journalism: A Critical Perspective." *May 1974*
No. 35 — Donald S. Kreger, "Press Opinion in the Eagleton Affair." *August 1974*
No. 36 — Steven H. Chaffee, Ed. Godwin C. Chu, Jack Lyle and Wayne Danielson, "Contributions of Wilbur Schramm to Mass Communication Research." *October 1974*
No. 37 — John Dimmick, "The Gate-Keeper: An Uncertainty Theory." *November 1974*
No. 38 — Mary Ann Yodelis, "Who Paid the Piper? Publishing Economics in Boston, 1763-1775." *February 1975*
No. 39 — Shelton A. Gunaratne, "The Taming of the Press in Sri Lanka." *May 1975*
No. 40 — Robert N. Pierce, "Lord Northcliffe: Trans-Atlantic Influences." *August 1975*
No. 41 — Mary M. Connors, "Prejudicial Publicity: An Assessment." *September 1975*
No. 42 — Steven H. Chaffee and Peter Clarke, "Training and Employment of Ph.D. in Mass Communication." *November 1975*
No. 43 — Donald R. Browne, "The Voice of America: Policies and Problems." *February 1976*
No. 44 — Donald R. Holland, "Volney B. Palmer (1799-1864): The Nation's First Advertising Agency Man." *May 1976*
No. 45 — Clifford G. Christians, "Jacques Ellul and Democracy's 'Vital Information' Premise." *August 1976*
No. 46 — James E. Grunig, "Organizations and Public Relations: Testing a Communication Theory." *November 1976*
No. 47 — Frank L. Kaplan, "The Czech and Slovak Press: The First 100 Years." *January 1977*
No. 48 — Douglas A. Boyd, "Egyptian Radio: Tool of Political and National Development." *February 1977*
No. 49 — Margaret A. Blanchard, "The Hutchins Commission, the Press and the Responsibility Concept." *May 1977*
No. 50 — David L. Paletz and Dennis LaFiura, "The Press and Authority: Portrayals of a Coach and a Mayor." *August 1977*
No. 51 — Manny Lucoff, "Telecommunications Management and Policy: Who Governs?" *November 1977*
No. 52 — John E. Nichols, "The Tinker Case and Its Interpretation." *December 1977*
No. 53 — Susan Heilmann Miller, "Reporters and Congressmen: Living in Symbiosis." *January 1978*
No. 54 — Jerry W. Knudson, "Herbert L. Matthews and the Cuban Story." *February 1978*
No. 55 — Mark R. Levy, "The Audience Experience With Television News." *April 1978*
No. 56 — Paul W. Sullivan, "News Piracy: Unfair Competition and the Misappropriation Doctrine." *May 1978*
No. 57 — Gail Lund Baewin, "Contractual Newsroom Democracy." *August 1978*
No. 58 — C. Richard Hofstetter, "News Bias in the 1972 Campaign: A Cross-Media Comparison." *November 1978*
No. 59 — Eric J. Zanot, "The National Advertising Review Board, 1971-1976." *February 1979*
No. 60 — Frank Wm. White, "Cameras in the Courtroom: A U.S. Survey." *April 1979*
No. 61 — Philip Palmgreen, "Mass Media Use and Political Knowledge." *May 1979*
No. 62 — B. Gordon Stephens, "Science News of Controversy: The Case of Marijuana." *August 1979*
No. 63 — John F. Robinson and Leo W. Jeffres, "The Changing Role of Newspapers in the Age of Television." *September 1979*
No. 64 — F. Jean Frazier and Cecilia Gaziano, "Robert Ezra Park's Theory of News, Public Opinion and Social Control." *November 1979*

No. 65 — David J. Russo, "The Origins of Local News in the U.S. Country Press, 1840s-1870s." *February 1980*

No. 66 — Michael Ryan, "Journalism Education at the Master's Level." *March 1980*

No. 67 — David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, "News Media Coverage of U.S. Senators in Four Congresses, 1953-1974." *April 1980*

No. 68 — Harold A. Fisher, "The EBU: Model for Regional Cooperation in Broadcasting." *May 1980*

No. 69 — Eugene F. Shaw and Daniel Riffe, "NIS and Radio's All News Predicament." *August 1980*

No. 70 — Jerome S. Silber, "Broadcast Regulation and the First Amendment." *November 1980*

No. 71 — Marlen Cuthbert, "The Carribean News Agency: Third World Model." *February 1981*

No. 72 — Terry Hynes, "Magazine Portrayal of Women, 1911-1930." *May 1981*

No. 73 — Wayne M. Towers, "World Series Coverage in New York City in the 1920s." *August 1981*

No. 74 — M. Gilbert Dunn and Douglas W. Cooper (with assistance of D. Brock Hornby and David W. Leslie), "A Guide to Mass Communication Sources." *November 1981* (Out of print)

No. 75 — Lawrence Bowen, "Advertising and the Poor." *February 1982*

No. 76 — Bruce M. Swain, "The Progressive, the Bomb and the Papers." *May 1982*

No. 77 — Daniel W. Pfaff, "Joseph Pulitzer II and Advertising Censorship, 1929-1930." *July 1982*

No. 78 — John Spicer Nichols, "Cuban Mass Media: Organization, Control and Functions." *November 1982*

No. 79 — Willard D. Rowland Jr., "The Illusion of Fulfillment: The Broadcast Reform Movement." *December 1982*

No. 80 — Robert J. Goldstein, "Freedom of the Press in Europe, 1815-1914." *February 1983*

No. 81 — James E. Grunig, "Communication Behaviors and Attitudes of Environmental Publics: Two Studies." *March 1983*

No. 82 — Karen K. List, "The Role of William Cobbett in Philadelphia's Party Press, 1794-1799." *May 1983* (Out of print)

No. 83 — Hugh M. Culbertson, "Three Perspectives on American Journalism." *June 1983*

No. 84 — Keith R. Stamm and Lisa Fortini-Campbell, "The Relationship of Community Ties to Newspaper Use." *August 1983*

No. 85 — Dean W. O'Brien, "The News as Environment." *September 1983*

No. 86 — Fred Fejes, "The U.S. in Third World Communications: Latin America, 1900-1945." *November 1983*

No. 87 — Warren K. Agee and Nelson Traquina, "A Frustrated Fourth Estate: Portugal's Post Revolutionary Mass Media." *February 1984*

No. 88 — David Paul Nord, "The Evangelical Origins of Mass Media in America, 1815-1835." *May 1984*

No. 89 — Gerald J. Baldasty, "The Press and Politics in the Age of Jackson." *August 1984*

No. 90 — C.N. Olien, G.A. Donohue and P.J. Tichenor, "Media and Stages of Social Conflict." *November 1984*

No. 91 — Mary Allienne Hamilton, "J.W. Gitt: The Cold War's Voice in the Wilderness." *February 1985*

No. 92 — Harry D. Marsh, "Holding Carter's Newspaper on School Desegration, 1954-1955." *May 1985*

No. 93 — W. Wat Hopkins, "Negligence 10 Years After Gertz v. Welch." *August 1985*

No. 94 — George E. Stevens, "Discrimination in the Newsroom: Title VII and the Journalist." *September 1985*

No. 95 — Denise M. Trauth and John L. Huffman, "Obscenity and Cable Television: A Regulatory Approach." *March 1986*

No. 96 — Richard Burket Kielbowicz, "Origins of the Second-Class Mail Category and the Business of Policymaking, 1863-1879." *April 1986*

No. 97 — Howard Good, "The Image of War Correspondents in Anglo-American Fiction." *July 1986*

No. 98 — Richard Lentz, "Sixty Five Days in Memphis: A Study of Culture, Symbols, and the Press." *August 1986*

No. 99 — R. Thomas Berner, "Literary Newswriting: The Death of an Oxymoron." *October 1986*

No. 100 — Judy VanSlyke Turk, "Information Subsidies and Media Content: A Study of Public Relations Influence on the News." *December 1986*

No. 101 — Kim A. Smith, "Newspaper Coverage and Public Concern about Community Issues: A Time-Series Analysis." *February 1987*

No. 102 — Marvin N. Olasky, "The Development of Corporate Public Relations, 1850-1930." *April 1987*

No. 103 — Pamela J. Shoemaker, "Building a Theory of News Content: A Synthesis of Current Approaches." *June 1987*

No. 104 — Edwin Emery and Joseph P. McKerns, "AEJMC: 75 Years in the Making — A History of Organizing for Journalism and Mass Communication Education in the United States." *November 1987*

No. 105 — Gregory C. Lisby, "The Consequences of Winning the Pulitzer Prize for Julian Harris and the *Columbus Enquirer-Sun*." *April 1988*

No. 106 — Jeff Merron, "Murrow On TV: 'See It Now,' 'Person to Person,' and the Making of a 'Masscult Personality.' *July 1988*

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS
1621 COLLEGE ST.
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, SC 29208-0251
ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
COLUMBIA, SC
PERMIT NO. 198